CHRISTENDOM

VOLUME XIII SUMMER, 1948 NUMBER 3

PRAYERS FOR AMSTERDAM

The First General Assembly of the World Council of Churches
Amsterdam, Holland, August 22–September 4, 1948

Let us Worship God:

The High and Lofty One, Who inhabiteth eternity, whose Name is Holy,
The Everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth,
The Living God.

Holy! Holy! Holy! Lord God of Hosts; heaven and earth are full of Thy Glory.
Glory be to Thee, O Lord most High.

Let us Pray:

That in every land, according to her special environment, the Church may be indeed the Body of Christ, the "beloved Community," the family of God, the one Divine yet human society in which all barriers of class, race, sex, nation, are broken down, and men and women come together in a real and vital fellowship, united in a common faith, common worship, and a common obedience;

That the Assembly may be guided to plan the World Council of Churches rightly, so that it may be a fit instrument of God's purposes for our generation;

That, through this Assembly, the Churches may be led to address themselves more earnestly than ever to the alleviation of distress, and to the rebuilding of the devastated Church life in many nations;

That new unity and vitality may come to the Churches throughout the world.

(Excerpts from *Suggestions for Prayer* issued by the Provisional Committee of the World Council of Churches.)

THE FORMING OF THE ECUMENICAL MIND

By ROBERT S. BILHEIMER

CHRISTENDOM in this issue presents five of the papers which have been written for the four preparatory volumes for the First Assembly of the World Council of Churches. These papers, together with the others which comprise the full volumes, are the results of what has come to be known as "ecumenical study." To most people, the first of these terms is difficult, the second dry, and the two combined altogether formidable. But what they represent in church life, although it may be difficult, is neither dry nor formidable: namely, the development in the past forty years of world-wide, interconfessional collaboration in Christian thought.

I

This collaboration has been a marked feature of ecumenical growth from the first. No less than twenty-five full-scale volumes, and an almost equal number of smaller pamphlets, have been produced in connection with the world ecumenical conferences alone. Beyond this, are hundreds of books and pamphlets which have been prepared for other ecumenical ventures on a less than world-wide scale. Virtually no problem of import to the Church has been left untouched in some degree: from the practical questions of missions policy, to the theological issues of man and his destiny or the ecclesiastical matters of clerical orders, they have all been investigated, with in most cases an astonishing forthrightness and thoroughness. Those who have participated in these studies, the conferences for which they have been preparatory materials, and the wider public which has scrutinized them have all testified to their value. Ecumenical study has clearly become a chief means of development in the modern ecumenical movement.

In order to assess its value further, however, it is necessary to see what is involved. The actual schemes for producing the envisaged volumes differ in their details, but in general two main elements appear in whatever process is employed. Of these the first is an alternation between ecumenical meetings and work in the studies of the writers and critics.

Thus, in the two years which have preceded the First Assembly of the World Council, three ecumenical meetings of Christian scholars have been necessary, involving, incidentally, in their total over 100 people who have represented thirteen countries and twenty-one churches. In between has gone on the work of writing and of criticism. Without both of these factors, the process falls short. On the one hand, significant ecumenical study depends upon the imagination, the sense of community, and the varying perspectives which are brought forth only by face-to-face conference and by a common seeking of the truth. On the other hand, careful thinking and criticism obviously must take place in unhurried quiet. What may be stated as an alternation of meetings and individual work, may also be described as a rhythm between corporate stimulation and individual thought resulting from it.

The second element is similar. This includes the interaction involved in the advancing of an opinion, the offering of a criticism and the amendment of the first statement. Every student of Plato understands what is involved here, and the capture of this dialectic in ecumenical study has proven of first-rate importance. It has brought forth an honesty of approach and humility of spirit in the discussion. It has meant that the whole has been formed in the atmosphere of search rather than in the atmosphere of dogmatic proclamation. It has enforced upon all those who have participated in the studies, and these include some thousands of people, an appreciation of the richness of the Body of Christ. Two different examples may be cited. The first is the process which was used in connection with the preparatory volumes for the Edinburgh 1910 Conference, in which a staggering world-wide correspondence — involving over 500 people for only the first volume of the seven — was carried on. The results of this fact-finding procedure were then studied and presented in a coherent report by a representative international commission. Constructive interaction was involved here between the members of the commissions as they worked upon the mass of fact which was before them. The second example is that employed in the preparations for the 1948 Assembly. Here an ecumenical commission suggested the subjects for the four volumes and the subjects for the individual chapters in the volumes, in itself a matter involving a give and take and the emergence of a clear conviction as to the issues which were of primary importance to the whole church — not an easy matter when the participants are as diverse as Anglicans and Baptists and come from backgrounds as different as central Europe, the United

States and the Far East. Beyond this, however, was the more important discussion which was held as the writers prepared the first drafts, to which critics throughout Europe, Britain, North America, and to some extent the Far East presented their reactions. Still different ecumenical commissions considered these varying viewpoints, systematized them and sent them back to the authors for synthesis or at least a positive answer to criticisms. Here the interaction was between persons and the convictions they held rather than in reference to a body of facts. But whether the basic purpose is fact-finding or the development of convictions and points of view, the process of ecumenical study involves the interplay of many diverse minds, the whole exhibiting the richness which is in the Church.

II

Ecumenical study has in the main two chief results. The first of these is consolidation. Each of the comprehensive study projects which have so far been carried on — those in connection with the Edinburgh, Jerusalem and Madras Missionary Conferences, the Oxford and Edinburgh Conferences of 1937, and the World Council Assembly — have been means whereby the mind of the Church has been made evident on the subject at hand. It is sometimes assumed that these studies represent only the ideas of a few persons. To be sure, they have not grown out of the gathering of mass lay opinion; but they have each been produced by a large and representative group, and they may to this degree be fairly taken as a gauge of the thinking of the Church.

This consolidation is first one of agreement; rarely, if ever, a common view of details, but a consensus of basic conviction. Again, we may cite two examples from the current study for the Amsterdam Assembly. In the summer of 1946, twenty-eight people comprising the Study Department Commission of the World Council met in England. Emil Brunner, John Baillie, Henry Van Dusen, W. A. Visser 't Hooft, Reinhold Niebuhr, Francis Wei, John Bennett, and Joseph Hromadka were some of the persons present. They had not met, except on an individual basis, since before the war. They had, in two days, to define the issues which, as the most pressing issues before the entire Church, were to be recommended for consideration by the World Council Assembly. The chairman of the meeting reported an amazing consensus, which appeared in a very short time and was very deep-rooted. Of all the possible subjects for discussion by the first Assembly to be held by

the World Council, these four were chosen: the nature of the Church; evangelism; Christian social reconstruction; the Church in international relations. To isolate these subjects was not a small achievement. The fact that they represent the mind of the Church is proved by the wide and enthusiastic reception which they have been given during the past two years.

The second example comes from the advance study of these subjects over the intervening period. Two striking convictions have appeared: the insistence on every hand that the primary task of the Church is evangelism, and the consensus in regard to the causes of Western social disintegration as lying in the combination of a loss of faith and the dominance in culture of the machine and mechanical techniques. There will be many criticisms of the way in which these two common convictions are treated, as well as of the way in which they are related to each other in the studies. The fact, however, remains that there is ecumenical clarity with respect to the Church's task and on the chief challenge confronting it.

Ecumenical study reveals, however, a consolidation not only of agreement, but of disagreement as well. The exchange of conviction, both through correspondence and in conferences, serves to sharpen and isolate remaining conflicting opinion. Those who have participated in the meetings of the commission dealing with the Church and international relations well know the tumult which has invariably accompanied these discussions. The Assembly will not be confronted with an agreed mind of the Church in this area! At nearly every point, the underlying question of Russian communism and Western democracy provides the center of disagreement. The same is true — although without the accompanying tumult — in the discussions in regard to the nature of the Church. The opening section of the preparatory volume, in which four different conceptions of the Biblical basis of the doctrine of the Church are presented, is evidence of the deep disagreement here. Disagreement, however, is not confusion, and not the least of the service rendered by ecumenical study is the consolidation of these disagreements into coherent forms which may henceforth be more directly dealt with.

As a reflection, both in terms of agreement and disagreement, of the state of the Church's thinking, ecumenical study has a chief value as a measuring rod. Many who read the forthcoming Assembly volumes will be encouraged that these representatives of the Church have been

able to go this far in corporate thinking; many will be deeply discouraged that they have been able to go only this far. Regardless of our reactions, however, there is gathered in these studies tangible, and to some extent detailed, evidence of just where we are, and therefore some indication as to where we must go.

III

A second chief result of ecumenical study is stimulation. One is inclined to feel that this is more important for those who participate in the studies than for those who read the results, not because the results are "poor stuff" (the ecumenical volumes have stood up well on their own ground in this regard), but because the stimulation among the participants is so intense. We have referred to the extent of the interaction between people engaged in these projects. Three things must again be emphasized in this matter. The first is the depth of difference in background among the participants. The second is the vigorous honesty of the discussions. The third is the very deep humility of spirit which has pervaded them. The suspicion with which Americans are regarded abroad, so well described by John Bennett in the Winter issue of CHRISTENDOM, is at first a shock and then a stimulus to deep thought. When to this contemporary issue is added the deeper factors of national and cultural background, and when this is further complicated by real diversities of Christian outlook, a virtual new world is opened up which never ceases to challenge preconceptions and arouse the imagination.

These differences are never glossed over. The writer is a newcomer to ecumenical discussions, and he will not soon forget sitting in a corner on the first occasion in virtual fear and trembling while the theological gloves flew thick and fast among the mighty. One comes to understand soon enough that it is only through such a completely honest and forthright interchange that any progress can be made at all. At times the meeting might break up or, on the wider basis, the correspondence cease to flow, were it not true at root that all are engaged in a common search. It is the very genius of ecumenical discussion that it is exploration, and that beyond all currently held conviction there is still more ultimate truth. Whether agreement or disagreement on the immediate issue is the result, the interaction throughout the entire process serves to stimulate a deeper penetration into that truth.

Stimulation results not only from the course of the discussions, however, but also in an important way from their results. This has been

particularly true in regard to the ecumenical publications since the war. Great portions of the Church have been terribly isolated. Spiritually, Christians have felt cut off from one another, and they have been without information as to what is being done and thought in other parts of the Church. This has been notably true in Germany, and the stimulation there which has resulted from the circulation of the chapters of the prospective Assembly volumes has been immense. The reports are that an astounding number of copies have been demanded, and that on every hand there is an eager study of them. The entire preparatory effort for the Assembly has been an important means of establishing contact between German Christians and those of other parts of the world. What is true in this dramatic instance in Germany is in essence true for all of us, for isolation is not a disease peculiar to war situations. Beyond this, however, is the fact that ecumenical studies can and do break new ground, and thus are able to provide the stimulus of genuine leadership. One recalls the Oxford conference report on The Church and the Economic Order and the Lausanne and the Madras Messages on the Faith. It is too early to judge the Assembly volumes, but the Oxford Conference volumes have found a permanent place in the libraries, and continue by their very quality to exert a quiet but important influence.

IV

Understood properly, ecumenical study is a factor of major importance in the development of the entire ecumenical reformation. It is not a means of publicity for startling pronouncements. It is not primarily a means of taking the Gospel to non-Christians, though it can contribute powerfully to the Church in this task. It is not, in the first instance, a means of addressing governments or other agencies of the social order, although again it may strengthen greatly the efforts of the Church in this work. It is at bottom a process whereby Christians are enabled to discover one another's concerns and convictions, thereby stimulating each other to an ever deeper knowledge of the will of God. It is one of the many quiet means whereby God is working through his Spirit in his Church to make it more fully the Body of Christ. On the one hand, Christians are led through this process to understand where they are, to consolidate agreements and disagreements, thus providing a means of judgment and a basis of repentance. On the other hand, they are led into new territory in their common search under God.

A RESPONSIBLE SOCIETY

By J. H. OLDHAM

THE subject of the present chapter is the right ordering of human society. The approach to that subject in an earlier chapter from the side of the advances in science and technics makes it clear that the crisis of society is at bottom a crisis of man himself.

A Crisis of Man

We do not mean that every man is affected by the crisis directly in equal degree. We must never generalize about man in general without having in the back of our minds the remark made to a theoriser by a friend immersed in practical affairs: "The difficulty I have, when you start talking about man, is that none of the things you say about him seem to apply to any of the men I actually meet." In affirming that man himself is involved in a crisis, we are speaking of long term tendencies which affect the lives of individuals and of different communities in varying degrees.

To assert, moreover, that the tendencies dominant in society menace the personal life of man is not to deny that contrary tendencies are also at work. The forces of life everywhere are at war with the forces of death. If it were not so, the battle would already be lost.

These necessary qualifications, however, do not detract from the truth of the statement that what we are facing today is a crisis in the life of man. Through the advances of science and technics men have acquired altogether new powers of shaping their environment and of changing themselves. Conscious of their successes in the transformation of nature, they are addressing themselves to the vaster task of transforming society and man in society. In the past men have acknowledged the necessity of submitting to forces they could not control. With the new powers at their command there is opening before their eyes a greater vision. They can picture themselves as taking on their shoulders the responsibility of forging their own destiny. In this outlook capitalism and communism, in spite of their differences, at at one.

It may be said that these are the dreams of the nineteenth rather than of the twentieth century. It is true that belief in the inevitability of progress has been severely shaken, more particularly on the continent

of Europe. But it would be a hasty and superficial judgment to regard this as an abandonment of the resolve to exercise conscious control over the process of evolution. In an adventure of such magnitude mistakes and setbacks, even of a grave and disastrous kind, are only to be expected, more particularly in the early stages. It is an unwarranted assumption that men are incapable of learning from their failures and rectifying their errors. The surprising thing is that, in spite of all the disappointments and sufferings that have been experienced, mankind as the whole is proceeding persistently on its course. There could be no stronger evidence of the strength and depth of the impulses by which it is driven forward.

How are we to regard from the Christian standpoint this radical revolution in the life of man in which with consciousness of increasing powers he takes his future into his own hands? There are many Christians who are ready to condemn out of hand the ambition of modern man to transform his environment as a supreme manifestation of human pride — a diabolic revolt of man against his Maker. But there is in many quarters a growing recognition that this is too simple a way of disposing of a real and profound problem. How could man have developed the astonishing powers he has shown himself to possess unless they had been implanted in him by the Creator? There is an old saying that no one contends with God except God Himself, and, if there is a God, the "Promethean powers" which antagonise Him must in some manner be ordained by Him; they must be understood as His most imposing and awe-inspiring manifestation.[1]

No modern thinker has shown a greater awareness of the reality and depth of this problem than the Russian philosopher, Nicolas Berdyaev, who constantly in his writings recurs to the theme that Christian thought must come to terms, as it has never yet done, with the creative faculties of man. Is man in seeking to transform his environment responding to a demand of God? Michael Foster has recently drawn attention[2] to the crucial issues raised for Christian thought by the fact that by the new powers which man has acquired he has been emancipated in large degree both from the tutelage of nature and from his dependence on his social environment and cultural tradition. All these have in an unprecedented degree become subject to the control of his will.

In a remarkable article on "The New Man"[3] Père de Lubac, one of the most powerful and influential thinkers in France, asserts that we

are witnessing today not only extraordinary changes on the surface of the globe, but, at a deeper level, a new type of man coming into being, transforming the more or less accepted idea man has hitherto held of himself, his history and his destiny; and that Christian thought must reach out to take this tremendous fact into its reckoning. Man, in the Christian view, is not placed in the universe as one thing among other things. He is not, for weal or woe, installed in a ready-made world; he co-operates in its genesis. Providence is not fate, but the power that conquers it. "Providentialism, in the sense in which it is too often invoked, is not a Christian truth. It is not encroaching on Providence to work for the improvement of an order of things which has been established mainly through man's own historical activities."

If the Church is to fulfil its mission in a world in which such radical changes are taking place, its own thinking must change. There must be an enlargement of the Christian imagination, which perceives that the range of man's freedom is vaster than we had supposed. The great Christian doctrines of creation, sin and redemption have to be thought out afresh in this far wider context. But while we must strive to achieve this larger vision, we cannot as Christians be blind to the greater perils by which the new possibilities are attended. The discovery of new values may so engross men's interest that they may lose sight almost completely of others that are of equal importance, or are even more fundamental.

Through the forgetfulness of these other, deeper truths, men's efforts to obtain mastery over the world have brought them face to face with problems, the range and gravity of which have hardly yet begun to be generally understood. In the first place, in the process of gaining control over physical nature men have called into existence a vast network of forces and intricate organisation which they are not able effectively to control. This "second nature" which has come into existence by human decision is in many respects far more alien and unfriendly to man than original nature. Of physical nature it was possible to believe that God created it to serve as a home for man, and that man's task was to co-operate with its processes. Men could believe that the process made sense, if they could discern it. But no such belief is possible about the second nature which has been brought into existence by man. No one could suppose that the evils attendant on the industrial revolution, which were the result of human selfishness, stupidity and shortsightedness called for any reverence, submission and co-

operation from those who were their victims. Because the effects of modern large-scale organisation are the product of human will, and bear the manifest traces of human blindness and injustice, they are apt to provoke resentment, bitterness and conflict.

Secondly, the attempt of man to order the world by his own unaided efforts lays on him a terrifying and well-nigh intolerable responsibility of choice. In all directions the range of man's choice is being indefinitely extended. In an unprecedented and increasing degree he holds in his hands the issues of life and death.

It is no accident that the philosophy of atheistic existentialism should be attracting wide attention today. In its more serious forms it is an attempt to face honestly the predicament of modern man. Men are now beginning to discover in their own experience the implications of the assertion that God is dead. They are coming to see what it means to inhabit a universe which cannot be conceived as in any sense the expression of an intelligent Creator's will. The traditional understanding of truth has been shot through with a sense of an order to which our thought must conform. But suppose that there is no sense of speaking of such an order, no sense in speaking of a universe, what then is the status of our thinking?

And what is true of thought is abundantly true also of conduct. Men are only just beginning to see what follows in respect of their judgements of value, if there is no order of values posited and sustained in the universe itself. The old-fashioned hedonist wanted to displace one code of conduct, accepted on the authority of tradition, by another believed to reflect more adequately the nature of things. To regard pleasure and the absence of pain as the highest good was to make an assertion about what is. But if there is no "nature of things," what then?

If the universe is without intrinsic meaning, the responsibility for man's future must rest wholly on the shoulders of men, since there is nowhere else for it to rest. Without support, without security of any kind and without succour from any source man has to decide at every moment what man is going to be.

This disbelief in any intrinsic meaning in the world makes its appearance at a time when both in thought and practice we have been made aware of the perversions of which human nature is capable. Dostoevsky opened up a new world of understanding in penetrating beneath the surface of civilised life and revealing the secrets of the underground man. Freudian psychology has disclosed the dark depths of the

unconscious. The bestialities of concentration camps and other horrors perpetrated in Europe have shown the impulses of cruelty and lust that are latent in human nature. If man decides everything by his own unfettered choice, if we live in a world in which everything is permissible, there can be no guarantee that it will not be the underground man who will in the end decide. It is this incalculable creature man with his explosive liberty who is the centre of the human scene and holds human destiny in his hands.

The concentration of interest in recent centuries on the mastery and acquisition of things has brought about an impoverishment of the human spirit. Man develops as a person through his relations with other persons and in striving towards a Perfection beyond and above himself. The subordination of these expressions of his nature to an excessive preoccupation with things has led to the progressive decay of *human substance*. In their absorption in the task of exploiting the material resources of the earth through technics, men have lost sight of the ends of living. In the exciting pursuit of knowledge, wealth and power they have ceased to ask what these things are for. They have in consequence lost in a large measure even the capacity to understand the meaning and importance of ends, which arise only in the sphere of personal living, i.e. through living in responsible relations with other men and in loyal response to the claims of God. They have acquired all knowledge, but have not love and, in so far as this is true, they have, as the apostle tells us, become nothing. This loss of his true being is the crisis of man.

In the recently published life of Albert Schweitzer[4] there is a striking passage which describes the trend given to his whole thought and life by a chance remark of one of the guests at a social evening. The remark was, "Why, we are all of us nothing but *epigoni*." As long ago as the closing years of last century Schweitzer had observed "symptoms of a kind of pernicious anaemia which was sapping the life of western civilisation" and which seemed to him to be "the growth of a peculiar intellectual and spiritual fatigue." It appeared to him that the ethical was in danger of being ousted by the expedient or opportunist, as a norm for personal and political conduct. The *Realpolitik* of German origin was being adopted by other countries. Governments were pursuing, and their people condoning, courses of action that were fundamentally inhumane. Everywhere the sacredness and freedom of human personality were being violated. "My own impression," Schweit-

zer writes, "was that in our mental and spiritual life we were not only below the level of the past generations, but were in many respects only living on their achievements, and that not a little of this heritage was beginning to melt away in our hands."

A Crisis of Culture

The crisis of man is inseparably bound up with a profound and far-reaching crisis of his whole social and cultural life. We are referring here, in the first instance, to western man. But the disintegrating influences of science and technics are invading the ancient civilisations of Asia and the more primitive cultures of Africa and threatening their foundations.

The late Archbishop Temple in an article written shortly before his death asserted that the real crisis of our time is not primarily a moral or political but a cultural crisis. He explained that what he meant is that "man is not a being ruled wholly by his reason and conscious aims. His life is inextricably intertwined with nature and with the natural associations of family and livelihood, tradition and culture. When the connection with these sources from which the individual life derives nourishment and strength is broken, the whole life of society becomes enfeebled. The present plight of our society arises in large part from the break-down of these natural forms of association and of a cultural pattern formed to a great extent under Christian influences. New dogmas and assumptions about the nature of reality have taken the place of the old. New rituals of various kinds are giving shape to men's emotional life. The consequence is that while their aims still remain to a large extent Christian, their souls are moulded by alien influences."[5]

Canon V. A. Demant has exerted himself in his writings to impress this truth upon his contemporaries. Thus he says in a broadcast talk: "I want here to interpret the crisis of our time as the breakdown of a civilisation. As a sociologist and a historian of human cultures I am sure, not only that this is the truest interpretation, but in the end the most hopeful one. If we go on thinking and acting as if this civilisation of ours is assured of its survival, or as if its strains could be cured by better political systems or economic methods or even more heroic morals, then — I contend — the breakdown will deepen into complete dissolution. On the other hand, if we frankly recognize that our western civilisation is showing, on the largest scale ever known, all the signs

which have marked the disintegration of cultures in the past, we may be able to plant the seeds of a renewal which will not have to wait until after a long period of utter decay. If men feel they are on the right track, even if it is still very unpleasant, they will work for the future. Civilisation dies when men do not anticipate the possibility of its death."[6]

The soil in which the life of the individual is planted has become impoverished and humus has to be put back into it before there can be any fruitful growth.

If the Church is to make an adequate response to the crisis, there are four major tasks to which its attention and energies must be directed.

(1) *The Practice of Communal Living*

The first indispensable task is to restore substance to the human person through the revitalisation of personal life in the living give and take, the mutual obligation and responsibility of a society of persons. If our diagnosis is true, the world cannot be set right from the top but but only from the bottom upwards. There is no way of restoring substance and depth to the life of man except by *living*. Preaching and programmes in themselves effect no change. Ideas and emotions have an effect on character only by being translated into action. The nature of man is not something fixed and static, but an energy and activity. Human living is living in relations with other persons and can acquire meaning and depth only in those relations. Since the number of persons with whom an individual can have direct and close relations is limited, the art of social living has to be learned and practised in small groups, of which the family is the chief.

The essential problem of modern society is, as Professor G. D. H. Cole has put it, "to find democratic ways of living for little men in big societies. For men are little, and their capacity cannot transcend their experience. These little groups are the forces out of which the new Europe must be built, if democracy is to be its ruling spirit. They are the nuclei of the new social consciousness on which alone the practical architects of the social order of tomorrow can hope to build a society in which men's higher faculties of love and creative service will have soil to grow."[7]

The Church is concerned with the primary task of re-creating a true social life in two ways. In the first place, its greatest contribution to the

renewal of society is through the fulfilment of its primary functions of preaching the Word and through its life as a worshipping community. It is the worship of God that is the source of all genuine renewal. It is only from His fullness that the impoverished human spirit can receive fresh life. It is only in response to the demands of His perfection that it can reach out to new tasks. It is His grace and truth which in the last resort guarantee and sustain the personal and cultural values which are essential to the health of society.

There is nothing greater that the Church can do for society than to be a centre in which small groups of persons are together entering into this experience of renewal and giving each other mutual support in Christian living and action in secular spheres. Such groups will find their vital inspiration in Word and Sacrament and in the fellowship of such gatherings as the parish meeting.

These things are true and fundamental, but to say them in the context of the present chapter is almost dangerous. They may easily suggest to us that all that is needed is for the Church to go on in the teeth of difficulties in the way it is going. There is no real understanding of the human crisis which does not bring with it a realisation of the remoteness of the present life of the Church from the realities of the life of society and of the magnitude of the effort that is required, if that remoteness is to be overcome.

It is only too easy for groups of the kind suggested to become self-centred, with the main emphasis on personal religion, as has been common enough in the past. The demand of today is for an effort that is shot through with a deep awareness of the contemporary situation. It must not be a retreat from society but a task undertaken in the conviction that the essential need of society is a new depth of the personal life. Everything hinges on the fullness of meaning that can be put into that conception.

Secondly, the Church has a direct concern also with the wider field of human relations, since it is in *society* that the meaning of personal living has to be re-learned. It is in the secular sphere that the real challenges have to be met, and it is in the meeting and overcoming of these real difficulties that spiritual growth takes place.

It is an essential Christian concern that as wide a sphere as possible must be kept open in which men can have direct and responsible relations with other persons. This sphere is the indispensable training ground for political life. Only those who have been moulded by their

experience in these human associations smaller than the State — whether they be voluntary societies for religious, cultural, recreational, philanthropic, civic or economic purposes, or agencies of local government — are capable of exercising the decision and thought that are required by healthy political life. Where the individual is without roots in a vigorous and rich cultural life, and all, or nearly all, his relations are directly with the State, he becomes a mere unit in a sand-heap of separate atoms, and the advances of totalitarianism meet with no resistance.

The vital necessity of a rich variety of associations subsidiary to the State is constantly insisted upon in the series of papal encyclicals dealing with Christian social doctrine. For example, in *Quadragesimo Anno* it is said: "It is an injustice, a grave evil and a disturbance of right order, for a larger and higher association to arrogate to itself functions which can be performed efficiently by smaller and lower societies. This is a fundamental principle of social philosophy, unshaken and unchangeable. . . . Let those in power, therefore, be convinced that the more faithfully this principle of subsidiary function be followed, and a graded hierarchical order exist between various associations, the greater will be both social authority and social efficiency, and the happier and more prosperous the condition of the commonwealth."

The importance of this doctrine in relation to our present mass society is obvious. Nothing can deliver men from becoming members of a herd and restore to them a genuine personal life except the widest diffusion of responsibility of initiative and of opportunities of co-operation with their fellows.

There is nothing in the results of disinterested scientific research as Mr. Aldous Huxley points out in his *Science, Liberty and Peace*, "which makes it inevitable that they should be applied for the benefit of centralised finance, industry and government. If inventors and technicians so chose, they could just as well apply the results of pure science for the purpose of increasing the economic self-sufficiency and consequently the political independence of small owners, working either on their own or in co-operative groups, concerned not with mass distribution, but with subsistence and the supply of a local market." He maintains that recent economic studies show that mass-producing and mass-distributing methods are technologically justified in perhaps about one-third of the total production of goods. In regard to the remaining two-thirds there are grounds for believing that even from th

economic point of view the advantages lie with local production rather than with huge centralised factories. From the point of view of providing opportunities for a humanly satisfying life, a policy of encouraging and fostering smaller groupings has everything in its favor.

A German collaborator in this chapter who has wide experience in these matters writes: "We believe that the breaking up of our mass society into smaller associations of various kinds in which genuinely human relations are possible is the foundation of a healthy political life. We regard this matter as so important, because only on these lines do we see a chance of working against the tendency to transfer decisions from the individual to a hypertrophied bureaucracy and so to reduce progressively the area in which he can exercise responsibility or share in its exercise."

It is in the wide field of rebuilding vital social tissue through the experience of communal living that the direct service of the Church to society can best be rendered. Service in this field lies closest to its specific and central concerns. It is also a service which, by reason of its traditional activities and its widespread parochial and congregational organisation, the Church is peculiarly qualified to render. It is one on which opportunities of endless variety lie everywhere ready to hand. Every available energy can at once be thrown fruitfully into the task.

The task of mutiplying opportunities of co-operation and of building up small communities with common interests and shared responsibilities may often seem humdrum and commonplace. The scale is so small that it is difficult to see how what is done can have any appreciable effect on the forces which are determining the course of history and the fate of mankind. Its results may often appear to be meagre and disappointing and may be brought to nought by forces beyond our control. The strength to persevere comes from the knowledge that relations with persons are the stuff of life and that through loyalty to personal obligations in a multiplicity of individual instances social tissue is being restored and new vitality is being infused into human society. In these relations with other persons we are living man's true life and the results can be left in the hands of God.

(2) *A Christian Doctrine of Work*

The attempt to lay new social foundations cannot be carried very far without coming up against the question of men's *work*. A man's work fills so large a part of his waking life that, unless his Christian

faith can impart a meaning to what he does in his working hours, it can have little vital significance for him. The restoration of substance and depth to personal living will amount to little unless it finds opportunities of expression in the large slice of the day which for the vast majority of men is devoted to earning a livelihood. The crisis of man, with which this chapter is concerned, will not be surmounted without a Christian doctrine of work. To develop such a theology of work is quite outside the scope of this chapter.[9] We can only emphasise its importance.

Taking as his starting-point and text the doctrine of work implied in the statement *laborare est orare,* Mr. T. M. Heron, who is both an industrialist and a competent theologian, frankly recognises that the assertion is of merely academic interest, unless it can be related to the conditions and problems of today. "Can a financier or a machine-tender," he asks, "really pray at his work today? Can he practise the presence of God as he plans his next deal or struggles against the monotony of his nut-tightening? Can he see in the thing he is making or causing to be made something which is being made for Christ's sake? Let us admit without reservation that, unless in each case the Christian can answer these questions with a simple affirmative, he must if he is logical, give up either his Christianity or his activity in relation to money or the machine. Full acceptance of the doctrine that work is prayer leads in fact to the conclusion that many of our present industrial activities should be classed, as lending money at usury and the gladiator's occupation were once classed, as callings which no Christian can pursue. . . . We have either to translate *laborare est orare* into modern English and mould our civilisation upon it, or else acknowledge as pretentious survivals every remaining bastion of the Christian culture."

There could hardly be a stronger challenge to Christian thought. Men cannot rest satisfied unless they can find a meaning, or at least some gleam of meaning, in their work. In the judgment of many observers the apparent lack of value in work is the crucial problem of our civilisation.

Meaning is present when a man finds in his work something of the joy of creation, the satisfaction of good craftsmanship. In doing something as well as it can be done a man has the sense of self-fulfilment; his powers are absorbed in doing what he is meant to do. "As a focus and framework for developing selfhood," Professor Calhoun says, "there is clearly no substitute equivalent to absorbing and cumulatively signif-

cant work." The complete, self-forgetting absorption of a man is his task can be at the same time an act of worshipping God. The giving of the self to God in his work of creation may be a form of prayer.

But not all men have the opportunity of being artists or of engaging in creative activities that absorb the whole of their faculties. Monotony, drudgery, plodding and unexciting toil belong to the human lot, and spells of these, in lesser or greater degree, have their place in all work. Where the satisfaction of craftsmanship and creativity is absent from work, or is present only in a minimal degree, meaning must be sought elsewhere.

Part of the task of restoring meaning to work is that men should be convinced that what they are doing, however laborious and exacting, is contributing to the good of the community as a whole. The connection between the work of a man's hands and the necessities and well-being of the community was self-evident in the small societies of earlier times. It is much more difficult to make the connection apparent in the large-scale enterprises of today. Yet it is essential that men should feel that they are making a contribution that is really needed for the life and work of the world. So long as they have this sense, even vaguely, and dimly, they can look on their work as an expression of their life and love.

It would be a mistake, however, to assume as Christians and idealists are apt to do, that the motive of public service can be in itself, except in a small minority, a sufficient incentive to maintain work at the necessary level of efficiency. Men are influenced far less by distant ends than by their immediate experiences. The few persons with whom they are in daily contact are more real to them than the far-off results of their labours. While a sense that work is worth while because it serves in some way the public good is necessary, it is with the more immediate incentives that we must concern ourselves, if a meaning is to be restored to work. We know at present relatively little about the variety of incentive which impels men to work. Telephone engineers, for example, in executing repairs are probably animated much less by a conscious desire to render a public service than by a professional distaste at seeing their machines go wrong. "The day to day structure of activity," as Mr. W. G. Symons says, "in a government office or in a factory depends on a whole complex of motives and incentives — emulation, professional pride, craft interest, hope of promotion, the drive of good leadership, interest in the pay-packet and so on. It is the duty of

those who have the responsibility for organising work to see that these various incentives operate so as to maintain efficiency." The relevance in this connection of the Hawthorne experiments in the United States referred to in an earlier chapter[10] is obvious.

All solutions of the problem of restoring a meaning to work are too simple, which fail to take full account of the extent to which modern machine production has isolated work from the rest of the context of men's lives. Large-scale production is dominated by a rational considerations, and the individual person is viewed in his functional relation to the undertaking as a whole. Instead of the machine serving man, man has to serve the requirements of the machine. We are confronted here with a fundamental contradiction between the claims of the human person and the whole structure of modern industry. Nothing will overcome this contradiction but a revolution in men's ideas by which human labour is conceived in terms not primarily of the technical process and the material product, but of human good; that is to say, of the human relations of those associated in the productive effort and the human purposes which it is designed to serve, the ultimate end and meaning of the whole process being found in the worship of God.

Is there a call to the Church to help in bringing about such a revolution in men's thinking? It is plain that little or nothing is gained by formulating a few abstract principles of a Christian conception of work. The Christian doctrine of work that is needed is not one that can be elaborated by theologians sitting in their studies. Any doctrine so framed would inevitably be remote from life. The only doctrine that can be expected to have any practical effect is one that grows out of an active wrestling with actual problems of industrial life today. It can be formulated only by those who have first-hand experience of these problems, aided in this task by such illumination as theologians and pastors can bring to them. Industry can be redeemed only by those engaged in industry. If the Churches are convinced that for the effective Christian service of society today a Christian doctrine of work is essential, they must realise that it cannot be provided in any adequate form through present machinery. New means must be devised for encouraging lay men and women in secular callings to wrestle in Christian obedience with the problems which they encounter in their daily work, and new provision must be made for giving them the help they need in addressing themselves to these tasks.

(3) *Collective Morality*

New complexities arise for Christian action in society from the fact that for the majority of men most of the decisions which they have to make or execute are collective decisions. It has always been true that most men have had to execute orders given them by their superiors. The difference today is that the growth of organisation has for immense numbers of people greatly restricted the sphere in which they are free to take independent responsible decisions. The nature of the acts which they daily perform is determined by conditions beyond their control and where, as members of a party, a trades union or an employers' association, they have a partial, or at least nominal, responsibility, the power of an individual to influence the collective decision, may often seem negligible.

The significance of this change is as yet very inadequately understood by the Church. It is not easy to feel "on our pulses" difficulties which lie outside our own experience. Theologians, clergy and professional people are withdrawn from many of the acute pressures of modern society. "The Clydeside ship-building apprentice," writes a minister of the younger generation, "the delicatessen proprietor, the accountant or the New York longshoreman knows in his bones more about the essential moral problems and tensions of contemporary life than the average minister can compass with his imagination." Yet it is just these moral problems and tensions that the Church must understand and take account of in its teaching, if Christianity is to be a faith by which men can live and from which they can receive guidance in the rough and tumble of life.

Much has been written about the decay of Christian belief. Far less attention has been paid to the rejection and distrust of the Christian ethic. In a sense the second may be regarded as an outcome of the first. Men's moral uncertainties are, no doubt, a consequence of their loss of belief in all absolutes. But their moral perplexities arise also from the fact that they can see little or no connections between Christian morality as it is ordinarily presented and the problems with which they have to deal in their daily life.

Mr. Middleton Murry among contemporary thinkers has seen with exceptional penetration what is really happening in modern society. In his latest book, "The Free Society,"[11] he maintains that a point has been reached in human development when the reality of the individual

person no longer resides in himself. It is the socialised man who is the contemporary reality. The individual person of traditional religious and liberal-political thinking has become largely an illusion. Willy-nilly the socialised man, which each one of us in greater or less degree is today, does what society as a whole does. He may as an individual *think* what he pleases; he may *say* at least a good deal of what is contrary to the ideas prevailing in society; but in the realm of action he is compelled to a large extent to *do* what society as a whole does.

In a society in which decisions in practical affairs have become collective decisions it is within the smaller groupings that the exercise of responsibility must, in the first instance, be asserted. It is in the individual factory, the party, the trade union, the employer's federation that the battle for freedom of conscience has to be fought and won. Political decision, for example, is generally understood as joining a political party, but it is a disastrous mistake to suppose that a man who becomes a member of a party is thereby relieved of all political responsibility and has simply to do what the party tells him. To remove any area of life basically from the realm of responsible decision is to withdraw it from the rule of God over the world. That does not mean that the decisions of his political party may not in most instances be in accord with the general outlook on political questions which determined his original choice. Nor does it mean that an individual, even when he differs from the party, may not quite properly decide to give greater weight to its collective judgment than to his own. But it does mean that for the man who is resolved to obey God in all his acts, direction cannot be substituted for responsible decision.

Group morality, in which the achievement of justice is the highest norm, must always differ from individual morality in which, in the Christian view, love is the guiding principle. But the problem is intensified by the unchristian character of our present culture and by the increasing social cohesion.

In a society in which Christians are a minority, we cannot expect that collective decisions will be based directly on Christian assumptions, which most of those who make the decision do not share. It is not by the full light of the Christian faith, but by some "refraction," as M. Jacques Maritain has put it, of that light that in the circumstances of today we may hope that the collective decisions of society today may be guided.

The insistent task which confronts the Church in modern society is

to help to provide ethical guidance for collective decisions and actions. Without such guidance the relations between groups must degenerate into a struggle of naked power. The problem of the morality of states in distinction from that of individuals has for long engaged the attention of Christian, as well as of general political thought. It has been widened in scope, brought closer to the ordinary man and made more insistent by the extension of collective action by groups. There is no more urgent need than for the supplementation of an ethic for the individual by a morality of group action. Unless men have such a morality to guide them in their decisions and actions in group life, and unless they are enabled to see a connection between this working morality and Christian faith, Christianity will seem to have little significance for life in this world.

Christians have to carry the dual responsibility of doing their utmost to further in the various areas of social life the growth of a group morality, which as we have seen can never be identical with the Christian ethic, and of maintaining at the same time a critical attitude towards it. The temptation, to which the Church has too often succumbed, of equating the ordinary human virtues of honesty, fair dealing, toleration and general decency with Christianity must be resisted. These virtues are not confined to Christians, and it only creates difficulties to assume that they are. Christians have to exemplify these virtues in their own lives and to do what lies in their power to make collective decisions conform to them, but they cannot rest satisfied with them. They are not bearing their full Christian witness if they are merely keeping in step with what is best in social endeavour. There must always be a certain awkwardness in the relation of the Christian to society. Life for him is not conformity with abstract ideals. It is a daily meeting and confrontation with other persons and with God in Christ. To what new and unexpected actions that confrontation may lead him he cannot foresee. It is by his openness to these encounters, and not by complacement conformity to prevailing custom, that he can introduce a new leaven into society.

What is involved in furthering the growth of a group morality may be made clearer, if we ask how the task may be carried out. If we limit ourselves to the contribution of the Church to the undertaking, a possible way of dealing with the matter would be to establish a number of chairs of Christian ethics in theological colleges, and to instruct the holders of these to devote special attention to questions of group mo-

rality. If this were the best means of achieving the object in view, it ought to be given a high priority among the many claims on the resources of the Churches. But in actual fact it would be quite ineffective in meeting the real need. There is undoubtedly a contribution to be made by reflective thought. But the practical problems which arise in real life are so endless and varied that general formulations and theoretic discussions afford only a modicum of help. The only hope of dealing with the problem effectively is that it should be approached from the other end. In the crucial question of Christian action in the complexities of modern society the answer can be found only by those who are involved in the activities of society, though theological insight and knowledge can be of great assistance to them in finding it. Few would probably dispute this truth in the abstract, and instances of the right kind of approach are not wanting either in the life of the Churches or in the work of some theological seminaries. But a genuine acceptance of what has been said would result in very far-reaching practical changes in the life and methods of the Church.

(4) *The Political Task*

We have considered, first, the task of recreating the substance of human life through personal living in relation with other persons, a task which lies in the main in the social and cultural sphere; secondly, the need of restoring meaning to *work* in the economic sphere; and, thirdly, the need for giving content to a group morality which will guide collective decisions in the economic and political spheres. It remains to consider the *political* crisis in which mankind is today involved and the tasks to which it calls.

The crisis is acute and things are moving rapidly. This chapter may be read in an international context widely different from that in which it is written in February 1948.

Science and technics, as we have seen, have brought about a new form of social existence, which is manifested in the free as well as in the totalitarian societies. What these have in common is almost as significant as the radical difference between them. If the new fact in history is that men today, with the new knowledge and skill at their command, are embarking on the adventure of taking conscious control of their destiny, it is to that tremendous fact that the Christian gospel has to be related. If the courage for such an attempt is lacking, the whole of human life will be progressively moulded by anti-Christian forces.

The political scene is so confused, and the difficulties of finding the right course of action so overwhelming, that many Christians are tempted to throw in their hand and look on Christianity as having to do only with personal relations and a private morality. There is a pietistic as well as a liberal *laissez-faire*. However pious the intention, it is a denials of God's reign in the world, of the Lordship of Christ over history.

The political issue which dominates the whole life of mankind today is the tension between the western democracies and Soviet Russia and its satellites. The question of the Christian attitude towards this controversy cannot be evaded.

In this political controversy vital human and Christian interests are involved. But it must be asserted with equal emphasis that the Church cannot identify itself unequivocally with either side in the dispute. It is debarred from doing so both by Christian principle, since no earthly political society can claim to be an embodiment of the Kingdom of God and all alike stand under the judgment of God, and by impartial examination of the facts. The Church, if it is true to itself, has its own criteria of judgment, which differ from those of the world. An independent attitude towards the idolisation either of communism or of democracy will win greater respect than an uncritical endorsement of one or the other. The Christian task is to discern elements of truth and goodness wherever they may be found, and to unmask and denounce unrighteousness in every quarter. The function of the Church in the present political crisis which threatens to overwhelm mankind in disaster is a dual one. It has to bear fearless and uncompromising witness to the truth which it sees and at the same time to exercise a catholic sympathy and fulfil a ministry of reconciliation.

It is by Communism with its totalitarian claims that the issues in the political debate today are posed. There is no space to consider here, important as the question is, what relative importance is to be attached to the present ascendancy of a Communist ideology in comparison with the deeper and more enduring forces of the character, environment, tradition and historical experience of the Russian people; nor in spite of its relevance to present political realities, the question how far the original purpose of Marxism to deliver the workers from economic exploitation has been replaced by a rigid system controlled by a relatively small political elite and directed to the expansion of Russian power. What we are concerned with in this chapter is the Christian

attitude to the conception of life implied in Communism which is a powerful ferment throughout the world and aims at a complete transformation of human existence.

It is necessary to distinguish between Communism as a political and economic system and as a totalitarian control of life. From the former there may be much to be learnt; with the latter Christians can make no compromise.

The Federal Council of Churches in America in a statement regarding American foreign policy in relation to Russia, published in 1947, assert that the critical and supreme political issue of today is *not* "the economic issue of communism versus capitalism or the issue of state socialism versus free enterprise. As to such matters, it is normal that there should be diversity and experimentation in the world." That a body representative of the American Churches should commit itself unreservedly to this important distinction is in view of the general state of public opinion in America a noteworthy fact. The same statement goes on to affirm that "the basic international issue is the simple issue of the police state as against the free society." This is, however, too great a simplification. The questions involved are wider than the police state and, while the police state is an intolerable denial of the Christian view of the proper relations of men in society, it may in revolutionary periods claim a relative and temporary justification. If the party in power have reason to believe that their political opponents will, if they succeed in ousting them, send them and their friends to death or a concentration camp, it is natural for them to take all possible precautions to prevent this from happening. An established tradition of toleration is necessary for the working of free institutions.

The forms of society which men create are determined by the responses which they make to the challenges of their environment and of history, and these responses depend in the last resort on their conception of the nature and destiny of man. Between the Christian and the Marxist views of man there is an irreconcilable antithesis. It is true that there are many affinities in detail between the two conceptions, so far as the structure, as distinct from the content, of the thought is concerned.[12] There is also, owing to the influence on Marx's thinking of the Judaeo-Christian tradition, a considerable measure of common ground over against rival philosophical anthropologies. But underlying these analogies and resemblances there is a fundamental and unsurmountable opposition, which makes itself felt in divergences all

along the line. In Christianity the central meaning of man's life is found in a transcendent relation to God. In Marxism the meaning of his life is found wholly within his earthly history. In the former the dynamic of human existence is grounded in a divine redemption; in the latter in human actions under the compulsion of the social structure.

This ultimate opposition is, however, for two reasons not decisive in regard to our attitude to Communism in the political sphere which we are here considering. In the first place, it might be claimed for Communism, whether justly or not, that, while it rejects the doctrine, it performs the works and that, like the son in the parable, while refusing to obey the Father, does actually fulfil His will. Secondly, in the world as it is today atheism is not confined to Communism. It is inherent, whether professed or not, in the claims of Fascism, and it is widely prevalent among the leaders of thought and action in the western democracies. It was liberal thought which undermined belief in supernatural reality and laid the whole burden of the guidance of life on man's shoulders alone. Atheism is a characteristic of the whole climate of the age. None the less the professed and militant atheism of Communism is a factor that cannot be disregarded in the present political crisis.

It is the grandeur of Marxism and no small part of its strength, and at the same time, from the Christian point of view, the root of its deadly error that, at least in its original form, and still in the belief of many of its adherents, it offers men a complete scheme of salvation. The fundamental concern of Marx, as Père Lubac reminds us in the article already referred to, was the spiritual liberation of man. The emphasis which he laid on man's social liberation arose from the fact that it is an indispensable means to the other. He insisted against Feuerbach that the human essence is no abstraction inherent in the individual but the ensemble of his social relations.[18] The question of men's social relations is of overwhelming importance because they affect and determine the very being of man. This insight of Marx is a perpetual challenge to Christianity.

What is said about the Marxist position in the following passage in Père Lubac's article deserves our close attention. "Of the Marxists we can say," he writes, "something analogous to what St. Augustine, with his own implied reserves, said of neo-Platonists: in one sense they rightly see the end but they prevent themselves from ever attaining

it by mistaking the road. They foresaw a liberated and united humanity, completely possessed of its own essence and reconciled with itself and the universe, living in utter fulfilment to the end of history. Do not our own Scriptures promise us the same ideal . . . the ideal St. Augustine summed up in *unus Christus* and *Christus integer*? But by believing that, to be attainable, the ideal must be shorn of all transcendence and realised in time, they deny its conditions and render it inconsistent. Moreover, by seeking it in history by incongruous methods, they prevent themselves from even approaching it or laying its foundations."

It is the promise of salvation, even though it be an earthly and material one, that gives to totalitarian societies the attraction which today they undoubtedly exert. "The totalitarian State" as Canon Demant has observed, "is engendering a conviction that men may work for the future." The appeal of the totalitarian movements is especially felt by those peoples who have been deprived hitherto, or feel themselves to have been deprived, of an adquate share of material advancement. If men are confronted with a choice between economic security and political freedom, they will unquestionably choose the former.

There is no reason in principle why material advance should not be achieved on a basis of political freedom, which has, in fact, been the foundation of American prosperity. But when the matter is viewed historically, it is apparent that there may be conditions in which only a strong centralised government wielding despotic power, can overcome the obstacles to economic advance and provide a framework of security within which other freedoms may later develop. It is at least arguable, for example, that the present regimes in the Balkans, or some of them, are the only governments that in existing circumstances possess the necessary strength to solve the basic economic problems of the peoples over whom they rule.

There are, as we saw earlier, no Christian grounds for condemning the effort of men to better their earthly lot and to bring to the task the widest exercise of their powers. But the actual results of the endeavor, as they manifest themselves today, cannot but raise serious questions. The consequences of an attempt to find the whole meaning of man's life within the temporal are becoming increasingly evident. If man is not made in the image of God, he has to be made in the image of society. He becomes a function of society, the instrument of impersonal ends. In the end he ceases to be man. Life loses its sacredness. Where the interests of the State seem to require it, the individual may be ruthlessly

sacrificed. While in important respects they are completely opposed to one another, Communism, National-Socialism and Fascism are alike in making the impersonal might of the collective an end in itself and in sacrificing individuals without mercy to this god.

This is not, of course, the whole truth about existing totalitarian States. No Government could survive that failed to satisfy in some measure the aspirations of the majority of its subjects. In every human society men's natural impulses towards community and co-operation seek some expression. It would be quite misleading to leave out of the picture of Russia its achievements in education, the promotion of health and the care of children and in giving to the ordinary man the sense that the country belongs to him and that he shares fully in a common life.

We are speaking here only of the *logic* of totalitarianism, when no higher authority is acknowledged to which the rulers of the State must have regard, and the State becomes a "mortal God." But the actual facts are terrible enough. Even when full allowance has been made for revolutionary fury, the Bolshevist determination to eliminate ruthlessly an entire class is the expression of a complete disregard of the claims of human beings as such. A recent carefully documented account of forced labour in Russia,[14] on which the Soviet economy seems to be irrevocably based, estimates the number of those employed in slave labour in labour camps at 15,000,000 persons, condemned to a brutish life of unmitigated toil in intolerable conditions. The expulsion of eighteen million people from eastern Europe, depriving them at a stroke of their homes, tearing up the roots of their historical existence, and leaving their lives at the mercy of an unknown fate, is a similar manifestation of callousness to every human right.[15]

The question which concerns us here, however, is not to pass judgment of Communism in the light of an ideal standard, but to consider it in relation to the practical political alternatives today. These may be described, briefly and inadequately, as the liberal, capitalist society of free enterprise, of which the United States is the outstanding example, and the attempt which is being made by the British Government, and by Governments or parties in various countries in Europe, to work out a new synthesis of the claims of freedom and equality in the form of a democratic socialism. How are these alternative political systems to be viewed in the light of the fundamental Christian understanding of the meaning of life?

It cannot be too strongly emphasised or too often recalled that, the Marxist movement, whatever sinister forms its later developments may have assumed, was in its origins a moral revolt against the injustices of a system in which man was exploited by man. Christians must often be put to shame by the readiness of young Communists to sacrifice themselves recklessly for the attainment of what they believe to be a higher justice and fuller humanity. We cannot oppose to the totalitarian systems the conception of a "free society" without a constant realisation of the ambiguity of the term freedom. It may mean the freedom of the Christian man to obey God and to serve his fellow-men according to his conscience. It may mean, on the other hand, freedom to indulge greed and lust, freedom of the strong to exploit the weak, the freedom of property rather than of men.

The question needs to be asked to what extent "free societies" have actually succeeded in realising freedom. We may take the United States as the outstanding present example of a capitalist economy, though the same things could be said in varying degrees of other capitalist countries before the war.

An exposition of the policies of the National Association of Manufacturers in the United States is given in Robert A. Brady's *Business as a System of Power,*[16] which also includes a long section describing, with full documentation, the economic, social and political policies of the central employers organisations (*Spitzenverbände*) throughout the world. The facts given in this volume have an important bearing on the question how far capitalist societies can claim to be free societies. In addition to various measures of defense against labour action, there have been developed in recent years extensive programmes for the "re-education" of the labour masses. The aim is, on the one hand, to change the ideological outlook of the ordinary worker and, on the other hand, by a special ideological training and by a carefully worked out system of incentives to attach to the interests of management the more ambitious youth who might otherwise become future leaders of labour. The more fully developed of these programmes of what is sometimes called "welfare capitalism" are all inclusive and attempt "to control both form and content of the *totality* of worker ideas and activities." In many of these welfare and educational programmes there is a considerable blend of idealism, to which Mr. Brady appears to do less than justice, and the benefits in many instances to the workers are undeniable. But it is a question how far such educational and welfare activities,

directed from a single autocratic centre, are in accord with the nature of a free society.

What is, perhaps, of more immediate importance for our present purpose, is that these central employers organisations are directing their attention to means of influencing or controlling political action and are creating for the purpose their own staff of expert advisers, constituting a business "civil service." They are also devoting a considerable part of the large funds at their disposal to the formation of a public opinion favourable to the policies which they wish to have carried out. Mr. Brady is of the opinion that "nothing fundamental in history, structure of organisation or social outlook, divides clearly the policies of the *Spitzenverbände* within the totalitarian countries from those of the liberal-capitalist states." No discussion of the free society is realistic that does not take full account of the growth within the economic system of a vast structure of political influence and power outside the recognised democratic processes. There is nothing which distinguishes the outlook that has been described from the ambition of state planners to shape history by means (in the phrase of Engels) of "a collective will according to an all-embracing plan."

It is not only in the field of government, however, but also in the social and cultural spheres that the influence of the large-scale organisation of the machine age makes itself felt in free as well as in totalitarian societies. "In the U.S.A. no less than in U.S.S.R.," writes Mr. Christopher Dawson,[17] "we are conscious of the victory of the mass over the individual. Moreover we see in America how material prosperity and technical efficiency produce social conformity, so that without any intervention on the part of the state, men of their own accord tend to think the same, and look the same, and behave in the same way. None of these things is peculiar to the United States. It is only that in America the standard of material prosperity is higher and the counterbalancing forces of authority and tradition are weaker. And consequently the United States has been the pioneer of a popular hedonistic mass civilisation which is the chief alternative to the totalitarian ascetic mass civilisation of Communism."

The conflict between the democratic and totalitarian States has its roots in the tearing apart, and the espousal by one side or the other, of two things that belong inseparably together — liberty and equal justice. A philosopher of the younger generation in Great Britain writes: "The conflict between Marxism and liberalism is a conflict between

the need for economic equality and the need for political equality in the ideal state. Marxism will be the ideology of those who feel the one need acutely, liberalism that of those who feel the other. The economic need is felt first. In plain terms poverty is more unpleasant to the poor than being regimented, at least when the regimentation is held to be in the interest of a higher standard of living and more equitable distribution of wealth. . . . You will never convince the bulk of the population of the importance of liberty (I am speaking from five years' experience as a wage-earner), until you convince them, by espousing their claim for equity, that you are not using 'liberty' as a catchword for reaction."[18]

There is no reason why the free societies should not offer to man greater social justice than a totalitarian State. There are strong grounds for believing that it is only the free society that can in the long run ensure progressive approximations to social justice. It alone provides the opportunities by which men can discover by common discussion and by experiment what social justice means and thereby progressively achieve it. Unless the free societies can by their accomplishments convince the masses of the truth of this, they must inevitably suffer eclipse.

When we take a world view of the situation, moreover, the defenders of western democracy cannot pay too close heed to the fact, to which Mr. Thomas has called attention in an earlier chapter,[19] of the impression made on Asiatic and African peoples by the racial attitudes and political and economic imperialism of the western democracies. Many of these peoples feel that their aspirations for independence and freedom meet with greater understanding and sympathy in Russia than in the West. The existence of this feeling, whether justified or not, may be of enormous importance in shaping world history. For the Church, it is a matter of supreme concern, since Christians in Asia and Africa are torn between the ties which unite them with the western Churches from which they have received their Christianity and the attraction of the greater social and racial equality which appears to be offered them by an atheistic Communism.

It might seem appropriate at this point to consider what has been called the third force — the attempt in Great Britain and elsewhere to establish a form of democratic socialism. But an adequate discussion of the movements in Great Britain and other countries to find a middle way between American free enterprise and Russian totalitarianism would require far more space than is available. Moreover the attempts

to strike out a new course are still in their beginnings and the shape they will take is not yet clearly visible. The ideas and convictions which will carry them to success have still to be defined.

It is not for the Church to prescribe to its individual members the political decisions they should make, and it is obvious that in an ecumenical assembly the political decisions that are open to its members and are demanded of them must vary greatly from country to country. All that ecumenical discussions can provide is aid towards an understanding of the general principles by which Christian action must be guided.

In an attempt to define the beliefs and attitudes which ought to govern the judgements and actions of Christians in relation to the political issues we have been considering, we must beware of lapsing into a moral idealism which supposes that the mere enunciation of moral aims can arrest or deflect the strong tides which are shaping our present social existence. The powerful biological, economic and political forces that hold men in their grip can be mastered not by ideals and aspirations but only by a higher and stronger reality.

The social order which Christians in virtue of their faith must seek to realise will include the following elements. There can be no question in the first place, that Christians must stand firmly for the freedom of men to obey God and to act in accordance with their conscience. This is the foundation of a responsible society. What is at stake is not merely the rights of the individual, but the moral progress of society as a whole. Only a society which respects the consciences of its members is open to the creative impulses by which it can attain to a fuller moral and spiritual life.

The question of conscience, which is crucial to spiritual growth, presents itself today, in a new form, since, as we have seen, humanity has entered on a new kind of existence. If the way in which men live and the things that they do are determined to a large and increasing extent by corporate decisions, the life of the individual, as expressed in his daily actions, can possess a moral quality only if moral purpose permeates the whole life of society and governs its collective decisions. It is only if men are able freely to participate in the making of these decisions that their life as a whole can have a moral character.

Secondly, to obey God men must be free to seek the truth, to speak the truth and to educate one another through a common search for the truth. Only through the freedom of its members to expose error, to

criticise existing institutions and to express fresh creative ideas can society advance to fresh levels of life. In order that this may be possible, there must be free access to sources of information, freedom of expression in speech and writing and freedom to criticise authority.

Sir Norman Angell has written an arresting book[20] in which he directs attention to the widespread disregard of, and even contempt for, facts in public controversy and the alarming extent to which men refuse to allow their actions to be guided by them. The present generation, he concludes, "is a generation more perilously threatened by the results of unreason than any which has preceded it."

This grave depreciation of truth is by no means confined to communists, but communists have done much to encourage it. Professor Harold Laski is certainly not an unfriendly critic of Communism, and yet he writes in a pamphlet,[21] as Chairman of the British Labour Party as follows: "The communist parties outside Russia act without moral scruples, intrigue without any sense of shame, are utterly careless of truth, sacrifice, without any hesitation, the means they use to the ends they serve . . . The only rule to which the Communist gives unswerving loyalty is the rule that a success gained is a method justified. The result is a corruption both of the mind and heart, which is alike contemptuous of reason and careless of truth."

Sir Norman Angell adds two quotations from Lenin. The first is: "We must be ready to employ trickery, deceit, law-breaking, withholding and concealing truth"; and the second: "We can and must write . . . in a language which sows among the masses hate, revulsion, scorn and the like towards those of different thought." Mr. Angell adds the quite proper comment that "Lenin's code, as reflected in the words just quoted from him, is the moral code of war; a code adopted towards the enemy by every one of the combatants in the struggle just ended. The Communist believes that he is engaged in the greatest of all struggles and that if he renounced those means of deceit and deception all good soldiers employ, then he would be beaten and the cause of the People would perish." We could not have a more forcible reminder of the way in which war, and the threat of war, threatens to engulf all the values which make man a human being.

Thirdly, the Christian is committed by his faith to respect for man as man. Every other individual is equally with himself the object of God's love. He can never allow the individual person to be absorbed in a hated class or disliked race. Every man has the right to an oppor-

tunity of expressing his point of view and of having it listened to in affairs that concern him. The principle was given classic expression in a conference between Oliver Cromwell and the officers of his army almost exactly three hundred years ago in the remark of Colonel Rainborough: "I think the poorest he that is in England has a life to live as the richest he."

This religious respect of man for man is the basis of true toleration. Toleration, like all qualities most worth striving after, may easily degenerate into something scarcely deserving of the name. It may mean a supine indifference to intellectual, aesthetic and moral values and a refusal to distinguish between good and bad. True toleration has its ultimate root in the religious belief in man's finitude. Truth is too large and rich to be apprehended in its fullness by any single individual group, school or party. It can be found only by the collaboration of many minds and the clash of opposed opinions. Those who are animated by this conviction will be ready to acknowledge the elements of truth in their opponents case. They will be prepared to listen to his exposition of it with a view to discovering points which they themselves have missed and to understanding the reasons for what seem to them to be errors. Where no reconciliation between conflicting views can be reached, they will still believe that out of the clash of opinions a larger synthesis will in the end emerge.

This belief in a truth beyond the grasp of any individual or party, in a universal moral law by which all alike are bound, is the indispensable basis of the free society. Those who refuse to acknowledge a spiritual reality of truth and justice to which all owe an obligation can have no valid objection to being totally directed by the state.

What has been called the free society might also (and for some purposes more advantageously because of the ambiguity in the meaning of freedom) be called the non-violent society — that is, a society which has recourse to violence only as the last resort. A fundamental difference between the believers in democracy and communists is that the former believe, as a result of experience, in a way that communists do not, that violence defeats its own object and perverts a good cause. No one who has a sense of realities will deny the necessity of putting restraints on those who seek to overthrow a regime that has the support of the majority of the people. But democrats believe that no unnecessary violence should be employed; that in broad historical issues what you think you are going to attain is never what you do in fact attain, and

that you can be much more sure of the injury to social health from intolerance and ruthless violence than of the consequences that will in the end result from this or that particular action.

Fourthly, the Christian will always attach a greater importance to the direct relations between persons than to the collective relationships which threaten to dominate our life. The latter are instrumental to the former and must be judged by the extent to which they foster a genuinely personal life in which true community is achieved. Institutions have an essential place in human life and may become the vehicles of personal living. But this can come about only if there is a revolutionary reversal of values.

We owe a debt to Martin Buber[22] for his persistence in recalling our minds to the immeasurable significance of the living relations between persons, which is the common stuff of every-day existence, and which powerful forces operating in society today may filch from us before men are fully awake to the incomparable value of what is in danger of being lost. Neither the individual as such, he insists, nor the aggregate as such, is the fundamental fact of human existence. The fundamental reality is *man with man*. What is peculiarly characteristic of the human world is something that takes place "between" one being and another. The essence of human life is what *happens* between man and man. It is in communication that man is man. To this profound truth the present age is largely blind.

It is evidence of the prevailing confusion of thought that there can be prolonged discussions on the relation of the individual to the community without any sign of an awareness that there are not two possibilities to be considered but *three*. The first step, as Buber rightly says, "must be to smash the false alternative with which the thought of our epoch is shot through — that of individualism or collectivism." What we are speaking of here is not to be confused with the "third force" which was referred to earlier. That was a possible alternative to communist and capitalist systems in the political field. The third possibility referred to here is a different dimension of life from the political. To recognise this other dimension which is "a primal category of human reality" would make a radical difference to all political thinking and action.

Acknowledgment of this higher dimension is not a way of escape from the realities of man's historical and collective existence. History is always "political" history — the struggle of competing groups to

maintain themselves. Christians can refuse to take their part in these struggles only at the price of renouncing all influence on historical life. To occupy themselves only with relations with persons, the very condition for which is dependent on the forces they ignore, would be disloyalty to Christ, who is the Lord of history. The relation between the two worlds of personal relations and of historical reality is one of the most urgent questions which needs to engage Christian thought.[23] What we are urging here is that the extent to which men are inevitably subject to the operation of impersonal forces makes it all the more necessary that these should be balanced by the experience of real community. In a society in which men retain the power to enter into relations with other persons, the working of institutions undergoes a subtle change, because those who work them know something of the true life of the spirit. New possibilities of action present themselves to those who govern. The health of society depends on the permeation of all its activities with the leaven of a rich and full personal life.

Fifthly, belief in the responsibility of men to God and knowledge of human sinfulness will impel Christians to set restraints on irresponsible power and, as has already been urged, to work for the widest distribution of power, responsibility and initiative, throughout the whole community.

Sixthly, there are theological grounds for believing that all the varied activities of man, religious, cultural, political and economic, should be given the maximum independence of one another. A tradition in which the independence of each of these is respected is the most powerful of all bulwarks against the all-embracing claims of the omni-competent State.

Seventhly, it must be the aim of a just society, exercising responsibility for all its members, to ensure that the material rewards of the common national enterprise are equitably distributed. This has already been emphasised so strongly that is is unnecessary to say more about it here.

We come finally to the question of political freedom, by which we mean here the freedom of a people to control, criticise and change its government. If that freedom is lost, there is no longer any check to prevent those in power from yielding to the temptation to which all who bear rule are exposed to gather more and more power with their hands and to destroy progressively all social, cultural and religious freedoms.

Political freedom is the foundation and guarantee of all other freedoms. It is not the *source* of all freedoms. The ultimate source of all freedoms is Christian freedom rooted in Christian faith. But, so far as freedom in an earthly society is involved, no freedoms are in the long run secure without political freedom.

It may be said that for long periods and over large areas men have had to live without political freedom and that for many peoples today it is not a practicable alternative to authoritarian rule. That is certainly true. Men have had in the past, and many have today, to be content with such freedom as they can get. But those who appeal to the experience of the past are in danger of leaving out of account the changes brought about by technics. It is true that the advances in science and technics have effected a radical change in human existence, the consequences must be fully faced.

In earlier societies, when tyranny become excessive, there always remained the possibility of rebellion. The knowledge that, if things were pressed too far, the subjects might rebel had a tempering effect on despotic rule. In the days when weapons were staves and pikes, or even muskets, members were a factor to be reckoned with. Modern inventions have placed in the hands of the ruling group not only weapons of mass destruction but means of technical control through the press, radio, and postal system which make successful rebellion virtually impossible.

Of still greater significance is the fact that modern inventions have enabled rulers not merely to control the actions, but to give direction to the minds and to play upon the emotions, of their subjects. In former days despots could do what they liked with men's bodies, but men's souls remained free. The new powers in the hands of rulers, the potentialities of which are only beginning to be realised, enable them to invade the citadel of the soul. By education and propaganda through school, press, radio and cinema they can mould men's thinking in conformity with their own desires. They can deny them access to sources of information which might lead them to form opinions contrary to those which the wielders of power want them to hold. By these means modern dictators can go a long way towards depriving man, not only of the capacity, but even of the desire, to resist. Technical advances have weighted the scales so heavily in favour of despotic rule, that it is a question whether political freedom, if it is once lost, can ever be recovered.

No one supposes that political freedom can be immediately achieved throughout the world. It has to contend with widely accepted ideologies which deny its value. In some places conditions are not yet ripe for its exercise. But in the western world there have been developed through the slow growth of the centuries institutions which, with whatever partial denials and shortcomings, are informed by the conception of political liberty. There is also an accumulated experience of the working of free institutions. It is an interest of mankind as a whole that these freedoms which have been won by long and sustained effort should be preserved and extended as an example, and for the benefit of all.

It has been our aim to show that the conflict between liberty and totalitarianism is not identical with the international tension between the western democracies and the communist societies grouped under the leadership of Russia. The forces opposed to one another in the international sphere are not a white against a black but two differing shades of grey. There are elements of freedom within communist societies which, however restricted in scope, contain possibilities of growth. No picture of Russia is complete which does not include the Christian Church with all its unknown potentialities for the future. In the western societies there are those who, both consciously and unconsciously, are the enemies of freedom. The real struggle for liberty cuts across all existing fronts.

But, true and important as this is, it is essential not to fall into the opposite and, as it may prove, more deadly error of supposing that, because we have to do not with a difference between white and black but a difference between two shades of grey, there can be no vital issues involved. The difference between a violent and non-violent society, between tolerance and intolerance, is a matter of life or death for the human spirit. It is a complete abdication of responsibility to suppose that, because everything human is relative, there are no decisive turning-points in history. Where the highest values are at stake, to refuse to make up one's mind and take a stand, because the issues are confused and there seems to be much to be said on both sides, may be a betrayal of humanity. In spite of the relativities attaching to all political systems and political actions the defence and service of political freedom may assume the form of an imperative religious decision. What is involved may be the whole question of what man is in the sight of God and of what God intends him to become.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Erich Frank, *Philosophical Understanding and Religious Truth,* p. 130. Oxford University Press, 1945.
2. *The Christian News Letter,* No. 299, Nov. 26th, 1947. 20 Balcombe St., London, N.W. 1.
3. Published in *Etudes* for October and November, 1947, and in English translation in the *Dublin Review,* 1948 (first quarter).
4. *Albert Schweitzer,* by George Seaver. A. & C. Black, 1947.
5. *The Christian News Letter.* No. 198, Dec. 29th, 1943.
6. *The Listener.* June 26th, 1947.
7. *Christian News Letter.* No. 90, July 16th, 1941.
8. Chatto and Windus, London, 1947.
9. Reference may be made to the relevant chapters in Brunner's *The Divine Imperative;* R. L. Calhoun, *God and the Common Life;* an essay on "Man and Work" by T. M. Heron in *Prospect for Christendom;* and a pamphlet by W. G. Symons on *Work and Vocation* (S.C.M. Press).
10. In *The Church and the Disorder of Society,* The Amsterdam Volumes, III (not yet published).
11. Andrew Dakers. 1948.
12. These analogies have been worked out in a remarkable way in an unpublished paper by Professor Tillich.
13. "Theses on Feuerbach," *Ludwig Feuerbach.* Martin Lawrence.
14. Dallin and Nicolaevsky, *Forced Labour in Russia.* Hollis and Carter, 1948.
15. Callous indifference to the individual is common to all forms of totalitarianism. National-Socialism, which deified not a chosen class but a superior race, deliberately put to death ten million persons and carried out experiments on the bodies of its victims with every refinement of cruelty. The infection of this inhumanity has penetrated into the western democracies. The facts which have been cited in the text show that slavery, which the nineteenth century did its utmost to eradicate from the world, has been re-introduced on a vast scale into Europe. By the retention of prisoners of war for labour purposes long after the cessation of hostilities Great Britain and France have shown how far they have succumbed to the contagion. It would be difficult also to point to a more signal instance of callousness to human life and suffering than the dropping of the bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.
16. Columbia University Press, New York, 1943.
17. In an article in *The Month,* January 1947.
18. Ian Crombie in the *Christian News-Letter,* No. 280, March 5th, 1947.
19. In *The Church and the Disorder of Society,* The Amsterdam Volumes, III, Chapter V (not yet published).
20. *The Steep Places.* Hamish Hamilton, 1947.
21. *The Secret Battalion: An Examination of the Communist to the Labour Party.* Labour Publications Department. London, 1946.
22. More particularly in his latest book *Between Man and Man.* Kegan Paul, 1947.
23. The issue is raised in a challenging form in a pamphlet by Dr. Gerhard Ritter, *Christentum und Selbstbehauptung.* Furche-Verlag, Tübingen, 1946.

THE SITUATION IN EUROPE

By JACQUES ELLUL

THE aim of the present chapter is not to give a general picture of the state of European civilisation but merely a description of the elements of disorder; the symptoms of the malady from which Europe is suffering. Of course, most of the elements in this diagnosis are to be found also in other parts of the world. But we shall deliberately omit what applies specifically to the rest of the world, and shall emphasise what applies to Europe only.

The Lack of Balance

The first problem is to state this disorder as a lack of balance between the values of traditional European civilisation, and economic and social conditions today.

It is not a question of divergence of doctrines. The opposition between the old and the new doctrines is either superficial or of little interest. The malaise in Europe today is not due to conflicting doctrines, even if we bear in mind the Nazi and Fascist doctrines on the one hand, and the Communist and Materialist doctrines on the other. These doctrines are really only a symptom of the deep-seated malady from which Europe is suffering; the chief characteristic of this malady is that there is really no doctrine which accounts for the concrete European situation and tries to direct its course.

European civilisation was formed around certain values which have given it meaning and have resulted in the formation of ways of life, social and political structures and cultural expressions. It is obvious that the two currents which run through the history of European civilisation are, on the one hand, *Christianity,* and on the other hand, *reason.* These two elements are not contradictory if "reason" is understood in its broadest sense, not in its rationalistic sense. These two elements form the basis of the values which have formed the background of our civilisation — values derived from the Christian ethic (which have become secularised, such as liberty, fraternity and solidarity), values derived from the Graeco-Latin conceptions which have helped to maintain a balance of justice. The conditions of life have been dependent upon these joint values.

From the beginning of the twentieth century and after a long preparation during the nineteenth century, the conditions of life have changed. The social, economic and political structures have diverged along independent lines, each one following its own logical course. We see European civilisation breaking up into anarchy before our eyes, because the economic, social and political forces have developed freely without regard for one another. The traditional values of civilisation are no longer moulding civilisation today; they no longer even take it into account. There is therefore a serious lack of balance, and we have reached a definite crisis.

In Europe the efforts to discover new values of civilisation which would polarise all the anarchical forces of our time are called Nazism and Communism. The conflict between these doctrines is illusory, since they both contain the very same fundamental principles (dictatorship, economic supremacy of one class or one race, "the end justifies the means," creation of a mass-civilisation . . .), and employ the same methods. The problem is to know whether these doctrines are able to construct, not a powerful State (which they obviously can do) but a *new* society founded on *new values*. Neither National Socialism nor Communism seems able to produce a new form of civilisation. All they can do is to organise a society in an elemental and inchoate form.

In face of this situation (which is felt more or less obscurely by everyone) it is comprehensible that people should try to hold on to the old values (and it is significant that even Communism appeals to the traditional European values when it comes forward as a protagonist of civilisation) such as liberty, patriotism, humanism, justice, etc. These ideas are no longer clear; they are no longer the straightforward expression of real sentiments — either of the people, or of their rulers. These ideas are no longer related to the material facts of our age, and they are only retained as a façade in an adulterated form. Finally these ideas are confused with social forms which are, or should be, condemned (e.g. freedom is confused with capitalism, patriotism with nationalism, etc.).

Our European civilisation is suffering, because it has lost the authentic values which would be capable of co-ordinating and guiding the forces which are evolving in anarchy and are tending towards a new civilisation, the characteristics of which are not yet determined, and may never materialise. It is not a question of a political or economic doctrine. Great Britain has shown that it is quite possible to live

without adhering to rigorous political doctrines. And we are not called upon to think out a new doctrine. Our task is much deeper; it is to discover values of civilisation which — with the material elements of our world — will enable us to build up a civilisation. Our present values are quite unsuited to our epoch, and are no longer recognised by the majority of people as being universally valid. The problem is really to discover moral and spiritual values which are in accordance with the material and intellectual conditions of life, which are accepted by the majority of men (consciously or unconsciously) and enable men to lead a balanced life, (even in difficult conditions), and to invent new forms of civilisation.

It is characteristic of the Roman Catholic Church that it is far more concerned with doctrine and political action than with fundamental questions. This attitude is perfectly useless, in spite of its external appearance of effectiveness. The Catholic political parties are once again compromising the Church by engaging in a political conflict of the worst kind which involves the spiritual mission of the Church in a political connection of a very dubious character. The social doctrine of the Church is to a large extent out of date; it is really only a by-product of Socialism, which itself — as a doctrine — can no longer keep pace with the events of our age.

Now, it is possible that a new, authentic civilisation may not materialise. Anxiety on this point arises from the acknowledged fact that the material forces of our time which are developing to an unlimited extent, tend to occupy the whole picture, to crowd everything else out, and to organise themselves in such a way that no new values of civilisation can be created. This organisation tends to be made in accordance with the necessities of development of material forces, and not by subordinating these forces to a higher end. Our problems is: Will it always be possible to regain control of these forces?

Material Forces Dominant in Europe

The State. We do not deny the value of the State. The State is willed by God, and has its own part to play in God's plan of salvation. Without it, an ordered life in society is impossible. But the State may fall a prey to demons, if the power which it represents refuses to recognise the supremacy of God. At the present time we are faced by an extremely dangerous type of State in every country in the world. This must not

be regarded as an isolated phenomenon (*étatisme*) which could easily be overcome. For the present evolution of the State is due to economic and technical developments, and has taken place with the consent of the larger part of mankind.

More than in the rest of the world (even in Russia), it seems that the dominant element in Europe is the State. Even if there is no authoritarian doctrine of the State, we are forced to admit that the power of the State is perpetually growing through the development of its administration; that its sphere of action is continuously expanding; that in itself it tends to become the criterion of good and evil (the supreme crime in Europe today is High Treason — that is, crime against the State); that it tends to absorb the life of the nation completely, and to form a nation in which the State is the dominant factor; that it is becoming increasingly abstract — that is to say, that it obeys its own laws, and ignores regimes and persons; that everyone in Europe assumes that the State provides the solution for all problems. This is true even of democrats and liberals: what they want is a different kind of State, but they do not want to change the nature of the State in its technical form (police, finance) which actually determines everything else. All the European States have not reached the same point of development, but they are all moving in this direction: Great Britain is an excellent example of this overwhelming predominance of the State in a democratic and semi-liberal form.

Production. Here again, as in the case of the State, we must be on our guard. It is not a question of rejecting production as the outcome of human labour. Nor can we put the clock back and lament over the past. I am not thinking about production in itself, nor do I say that it is a bad thing. But we must look at the present problem in relation to our present disorder, and to the general attitude to production. Now the whole of Europe is haunted by the idea of production. From one point of view this is comprehensible: the necessity of repairing war-damage, and the effort to re-establish a possible standard of life. It is clear that if we are to achieve stability in Europe, production is essential.

But this tendency, actually a sound one, is not temporary; it is permanent and forms the very basis of the economic systems (whatever they may be) which are developing in Europe. Liberalism and Socialism agree on this principle: "Production governs all." They dis-

agree only about methods and distribution. The underlying tendency is to subordinate everything to production, including man, who becomes merely an instrument of production (and not only the workers, but the staff, the directors, etc.) and including spiritual values whose mission is becoming more and more simply that of providing pretexts in favour of production (e.g. the ideology of economics). It does not occur to anyone to challenge the idea that man exists in order to produce more and more. Contrary to socialism, the most active factor in proletarisation is not the existence of private property, but the fact of this primacy of production. Hence this is one of the most burning problems of our civilisation, and for this reason: if we wish to make a serious analysis of our economic difficulties and of the breakdown of humanist civilisation, we must bear in mind that one of its essential causes is this assumption that "production must come first." I do not mean that "over-production" is the cause of the crisis. It has nothing to do with it. But if the law of production be allowed to take precedence of all other values — which is characteristic of our own time — it is a catastrophe, and no human civilisation can possibly make this law its starting point.

I will not go into the general problem of technics in civilisation and its moral and political repercussions, since I have already described this several times elsewhere. I shall not, therefore, discuss the question whether technics are good or bad, but only that aspect which concerns the European crisis.

Technics. Possibly this material force plays a less important part in Europe than in the United States. Most Europeans have lost faith in Progress, Science, and Technics, and are no longer hopeful that everything will be solved by these means; whereas in the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. technics still reign supreme. But this is one of the characteristics of the problem in Europe; fresh technical systems are imposing themselves upon us and invading the whole field of human activity. In certain cases Europe is tending to become an experimental laboratory for new technics, especially in the political sphere (propaganda, concentration camps, displaced persons, political and social realism, Eastern democracy, and the one-party game, etc.). In other cases technics of American origin are being applied to Europe, and are open to the usual contagion. But Europe as a whole no longer believes in these technics — and no longer has the strength, nor the spiritual ele-

vation, nor the social organisation required, to enable it to control the technical instruments which it is being induced to employ. Thus Europe is being led to follow a path which is *no longer* its own.

On the other hand, in Europe the unifying power of technics is tending more and more rapidly to standardise political, social and economic conditions, and to turn the Continent of Europe into a solid *bloc*. Now this is taking place at the very moment when the Continent of Europe is divided politically into two zones of influence, and when the last traces of "European civilisation" are disappearing — that is to say, at the moment when the spiritual structure of Europe is breaking down. Thus this unifying tendency of technics is causing a crisis owing to the political obstacles which it encounters, and the absence of any spiritual foundation.

A final element in the political and social world of Europe is *war*. During the last century war has changed its character. It is no longer an accident, a breakdown of peace, as it has always been during the course of history. War has become one of the permanent elements in our society. We have now reached a culminating point in this transformation: European society is entirely built up on a war basis (in this direction Europe has gone farther than the rest of the world which is moving in the same direction). The disharmony between the old ideas and the new facts comes out very clearly at this point: we are still using the methods of diplomacy which proved useful in the days when war was still an "accident," to try to prevent the kind of war which has now become part of our social structure. Moreover, it is not only war between nations which — by becoming totalitarian — has helped to change the idea of war, but also class-war which is a permanent element in the life of Europe alone.

These different tendencies force us to recognise a society which will be completely subject to them when they are fully developed, and in which it will be impossible to create a human civilisation.

The Position of Man

Confronted by these forces, the situation of European man is desperate. First of all, from the material point of view his position is impossible: he is suffering from the disastrous results of an inhuman use of power by the State, of the primacy of production, of an extreme development of technics, without reaping any of the undoubted advantages connected with the latter process: Europe is not wealthy. The

following facts must be borne in mind: the growth of large and crowded cities, with its evil consequences for the life of their inhabitants, from the moral, psychological, and physiological point of view; the fact that labour conditions become increasingly severe, coupled with uncertainty of employment; the disintegration of family life, due to economic and industrial conditions, and to the pressure of State control; the disappearance of the middle classes from European society, which is becoming increasingly proletarian, owing to the actual situation in the economic and social sphere. These facts mean that European man cannot rise to the height required to set the standard for a new civilisation.

This is confirmed by the grave fact that in reality there is no further question of measuring and basing the new civilisation on the real man, as he actually is. Today man is subordinated to *things* and the coming society is a society made for these things and not for man, conceived because of things and not because of man. This primacy of the *thing* is the highest note of triumph of technics and production. Man must subordinate himself to the necessity of things, or be considered as a thing himself — a fact easily accepted by modern science and utilised by modern politics. Two significant facts stand out: European culture is now centred on the physical and biological sciences and no longer on the "humanities"; and European politics are becoming mass-politics, based on the supposition that man is a thing (cf., propaganda, etc.).

This leads to the attempt to create a definite type of man. But here emphasis must be laid on the special place of Europe. All over the world today societies are trying to create artificially the ideal type of man to fit into this society, i.e. to create the thing with which society can do what it likes. The United States are tending to create this type of man, simply through social milieu and conformity. The U.S.S.R. is trying by every means to create a type of man in conformity with Marxist doctrine. In Europe, owing to the dominance of political life, the tendency is for man to be the tool of the State, but this is not general throughout the twentieth century nor in all countries. It is a sporadic tendency, but nevertheless a very vigorous one. In this way the type of radical lay Frenchman was created by the Third Republic, and the German Nazi. This tendency to create artificially an average type of man for the service of the State is one of the deepest signs of Europe's decadence, and the abandonment by man himself of his dignity and responsibility.

Undoubtedly there is a growing tendency to create another type of man, who stands out above the masses: that is, the man who shoulders all the responsibilities and makes all the decisions. He corresponds to Burnham's "Manager." It is the technician who dominates and directs society in every sphere. But this man is not a superman, in spite of his powers; he himself is closely dependent on, and subject to, the technics which he has to apply.

This type of man has not yet been developed very far in Europe, in spite of the prominent part it played in Nazi Germany. But it is probable that as organisation increases, this new "nobility" will emerge.

This tendency has been made possible by a phenomenon which it is most important to recognise as characteristic of our Western world: dissociation of thought and action. This process of dissociation is taking place simultaneously on the following planes: *on the psychological plane* (man acts for reasons which are not "his own," and, inversely, he no longer expresses his thought in an act. Here are two examples; in the first sense, the influence of publicity; in the second sense, artistic surrealism); *on the social plane* (for instance, the intellectuals have lost contact with the rest of the nation, and no longer have any influence on society. Increasingly, the masses influence the common life, and when we speak of the "masses" in this sense, we mean action which has not been willed, but is due to sociological reactions): *on the political plane* (an increasing tendency to use all political doctrines as "counters" in the political game and, in the sphere of action, conflict between the State and the administration — the use of political myths).

The deep spiritual cause of this dissociation can be summed up in a phrase: modern man no longer has any *spiritual cohesion*. The relation between God and man, like the relation between man and the world, has been distorted by secular influences, so that man no longer sees himself, or the world, in their true light.

The Totalitarian Nature of This Society

This kind of society, which tends to be constituted by a mere combination of material forces, and thus denudes man of significance, is totalitarian, even if no explicitly totalitarian doctrine is invoked.

Socialism tried to subordinate man, as a whole, to the State, and to use him for its ends; but French or English democracy wants to do exactly the same. Society will not accept the man who refuses to work, nor

the man who refuses to insure himself against unemployment and illness (social security); man is becoming more and more part of the social mass — and it is the *whole* man who is involved.

This society is totalitarian in a second sense: it tends to unify the whole of life. In the effort to raise the standard of living, from the economic point of view, it has been necessary to take large-scale action (man has been forced to merge his identity in large groups and, in extreme cases like Communism, to lose his individual consciousness) and to "rationalise" the conditions of life. In Europe this attempt at rationalization is carried on very unequally: very actively in France and Germany; slowly but surely in England and the Nordic countries; hardly at all in Spain, Switzerland and Holland.

At this point we must also emphasize the fact that what we have stated so far varies very much in different countries and different parts of Europe, when we look at them in their present situation. For instance, the presence of "intermediate" groups which are vigorous in certain countries (Switzerland, England, Holland) makes the power of the State less direct, and the totalitarian nature of society less apparent. But when one is examining an illness, one must try to foresee how it will develop. Here we are trying to diagnose this development, and we then perceive that in this respect the difference between the countries of Europe is no longer a difference in kind but a difference of degree; they are all moving in the same direction, but are at different stages. And they will pass through these stages all the more quickly when the European bloc has taken more definite shape.

Finally this society is totalitarian because it embraces the known means of action and thought, and utilises everything, or rather turns it to its own advantage. Every attempt to break the circle results only in closing it more firmly: the social security plan, the Beveridge plan, etc., make the individual still more a mere cog in the larger unit, and force him to give up more of his personal life.

Leisure-time pursuits (the cinema, sport) only lead to a still greater social conformity, and aid man to adapt himself more willingly to non-human conditions. A remarkable example of the creation of a totalitarian society by the organization of "leisure" is provided by England, in the phenomenon of Butlin's Holiday Camps. All this seems still stranger when we reflect that the war against National Socialist Germany has led all its enemies to adopt its methods (total war, concentration camps, State interference with private life, etc.).

The Failure of the Church

In our diagnosis of the disorder in Europe, we cannot ignore the failure of the Church. This is seen clearly in the following fields:

The Church has left the care and the protection of man to others. In the intellectual sphere, the Church has left the protection of man to science and philosophy; in the economic and social sphere it has left his protection to socialism. And the Church has made serious compromises with those who control finance. This explains why the Church is so conventional and why it allows man to fall into the hands of those who could only lead him astray.

The Church has left to others the responsibility for revolution. The Church exists in order to insist on constant change in society and civilization, in order to bring them more into conformity with the order of God. This is a mission of "permanent revolution." But the Church has completely lost sight of the fact that an order of God exists, and it has accepted the established order of things. Hence instead of representing values of transformation and judgment (justice, freedom, etc.) founded on Jesus Christ, the Church has merely stood for conservative values, and has left the revolutionary function in the hands of political parties.

The Church has left to others the responsibility for the spiritual life of the peoples. The Church has become introspective and has forgotten that the Gospel must be present *in the midst* of the people and that this can only be achieved by constant movement, by great movements of evangelization which, even if they do not lead to the conversion of all, do draw the spiritual life of the nation towards the Gospel. The Church has restricted its work exclusively to individual witness and private conversion, and has left the nations of Europe to seek their spiritual food elsewhere: the State with its myths gave them what they required. In the public sphere the Church, especially the Catholic Church, took up a political position, and not a spiritual one, with the same result.

It is evident that this threefold failure of the Church is not intentional. The Church has never willingly renounced its influence in the world. But it is an actual state of affairs due to many causes: the Church's subservience to the State; the Church's attachment to a given economic form, namely capitalism (which has led the Church to conform to the prevailing political and social system); division and hostil

ity between the churches; misunderstanding of the Church's role which made it act as a political force (through political parties). All these causes have been effective only in so far as the Church had no clear view of its divine mission, and was not constantly on the alert to hear God's message.

And as, in the Church, God always preserves a "remnant," the Church's failure has not been absolute. But it is only through loyalty to the will of God revealed in Scripture, and through repentance, that the Church can rediscover its threefold responsibility towards the world.

THE ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT AND THE YOUNGER CHURCHES

By PAUL DAVID DAVANANDAN

IT is too early in the day to assess the extent of the influence of the ecumenical movement on the life and thought of the younger Churches. During the fateful period of the war the World Council of Churches was still in formation; and its direct impact had to be limited to the nearer reach of the older Churches in Europe and America. In the meantime, several events of far-reaching importance have taken place in the countries of the younger Churches. Japan is no longer the first class power that it was; China is still recovering from the ravages of war and internal discord; India is now divided into two dominions which are not yet reconciled to each other; the island peoples of the Far East have been quickened to new self-consciousness.

Altogether in the younger Churches the period of the war set back progressive Christian undertakings which were directed towards objectives inspired by the ecumenical spirit. For one thing, many projects for expansion and consolidation for which we had counted on resources of strength in men and money from abroad had to be shelved. We had to make the most of what we had, with whatever foreign help that was still available in addition.

These very adverse circumstances, at the same time, provided opportunities for inter-church and inter-mission co-operation on an unprecedented scale, especially in areas where orphaned missions continued to work. In places where missionary leaders were forced to leave, on account of enemy action, native lay leaders carried on. By necessity they kept on in total disregard of denominational differences, in the larger interests of maintaining the unity and the fellowship of the faith. In some areas the sudden turn of political events brought compulsion on the Church, sometimes by state action, to close its divisions and form one organization.

Local conditions in the various younger Churches of the East differ widely. Even in the same country, the Church is in different stages of development in different areas. What is attempted in this paper is a review of the situation mainly with reference to conditions prevailing

in India. A good deal of what is said about the younger Church in India may be, to an extent, true of younger Churches in general, at least by implication.

One thing must be stated at the outset. It may well be claimed that the modern concern for Christian unity in Protestantism acquired a new momentum when confronted by the practical needs of the missionary enterprise in non-Christian lands. At any rate, as the International Missionary Council took shape, and the vision of world-evangelism at Edinburgh (1910) inspired men and women in the different mission fields to undertake co-operative action through what later came to be known as the various National Christian Councils, an added justification and urgency was given to the growing desire for Christian fellowship, as well in the life and work of the Church as in its faith and order. If Oxford and Edinburgh (1937) registered the approval of Christian thought in the older Churches, Madras expressed the desire of the younger Churches, that it was time for us as a world-community to recover and possess that ecumenical oneness which is God's design for His people. All this is a matter of history, but it is not always recognized that the missionary enterprise and the ecumenical movement are closely inter-related.

What the younger Churches have given to the movement is little, indirect and pragmatic rather than positive and ideological. The reason is not far to seek. We are still young; some of us are still in the "mission-stage" of infancy; not all of us have come of age. Perhaps our contribution to the ecumenical movement is still to be made. Before we discuss the possible nature of what we of the younger Churches are likely to contribute to the movement, we may pause to consider what the immediate effects of the movement have been so far on our life and experience.

One remarkable difference between the Jerusalem and Madras Meetings of the International Missionary Council was the emphasis rightly placed on the Church. On the mission field we had not always recognised in our preaching that the Church formed a fundamental feature of the Gospel, that to invite non-Christians to accept the Christian way of life necessarily implied an invitation to join the Church. "Is the challenge of the Gospel to India fully declared unless all the time it is presented as including in the directest possible way, a challenge to join the organised Church of Christ?" asks Dr. A. G. Hogg in his recent study on *The Christian Message to the Hindu.* "And must

not the command 'Follow Me' have as an intrinsic part of its meaning a summons to join His New Israel — that Church of Which He . . . selected the first leaders?" And Hogg goes on to add, "Whether or not this note was insufficiently stressed in the preaching and teaching of my contemporaries on the Indian mission-field, I have to make regretful confession that it had very little place in my own teaching. This was because, until almost the end of my missionary career, the idea of the Church was no intrinsic part of my conception of the Gospel."

It can be said with little fear of contradiction that what makes the primary difference in outlook between the leaders of a previous generation in the younger Churches and those who are the leaders of today (both local and foreign) is that they perceive no mere "consequential relation" between Gospel and Church but a relation which is both "integral and constitutive." Undoubtedly this changed understanding is due to the influence of the ecumenical movement on our thought-life. In the early days of the movement towards Church union in South India the dynamic came from two sources: one was the practical necessity for co-operation, forgetting our differences, so that we may more effectively and economically carry on the evangelistic task; the other was the drive of a blind sentiment based on the swell of impulsive feeling which refused to admit that Christian unity can permit differences.

As the negotiations for union in South India proceeded, the ecumenical movement in the older Churches gathered force. We profited by your studies and conferences. We came to a fresh understanding of the Biblical basis of the Church, of the historical traditions connected with various denominational views concerning the ministry, and we realised the significance of the symbolic rite of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper as a ratification of the essential unity of all believers in fellowship with one another and with the Head of the Church.

Now that the Church of South India is an accomplished fact, we look back with thankfulness that in all our travail to interpret locally in the life of the Church in South India the ecumenical oneness of the World Christian Community, we had kept the following ideals firmly in view: (1) The unity of the Church is organic. (2) It comes about in the actual process of growing into unity. (3) It is possible to comprehend and include all that is valuable and worth preserving in the different denominational traditions. (4) A transitory period of adjustment and "irregularity" is inevitable.

In both the younger and older Churches there has been a manifest

desire to work for unity. But while we talk in terms of "unity" in the hope of a future good to be realised, you of the older Churches invariably think in terms of "reunion" with your minds retracing the past history of divisions hallowed by the memory of saints and martyrs. This seems to be a fundamental difference in outlook. It is responsible for your emphasis on a "federal basis" of union while our insistence is on "organic" union. In the immediate years to come, as the younger Churches grow in strength and influence and as they become more and more independent of their connection with the older Churches, this difference in outlook and objective will become pronounced.

Paradoxically enough, one of the blessings of the ecumenical movement in the older Churches is the fresh discovery that many devout men and women have made of the significant values contained in the traditional teaching of their various denominations. It is true that there has been a clearer conception of the Church. But alongside of this there is growing self-consciousness of the denominational Churches too, and in some cases Christians of a denomination with large membership in different countries have come together to form world-federations and ecumenical conferences. To us of the younger Churches, it is passing strange that with the spread of the ecumenical movement, and frequently as a direct consequence of it, many smaller sects and sub-denominations have now become prominent and active participants in the national councils of churches in countries like Britain and the United States.

This revival of denominationalism concerns us vitally. Many small missionary societies from the lands of the older Churches, sponsored and supported by some one or other of these minor denominations, feel justified in starting evangelistic work in areas where the younger Church is moving towards organic unity. They tend to counteract what seems to us progress towards unity. This anomalous situation can be very distressing in areas where "missions" supported by funds from abroad and "Churches" directed by local leadership exist side by side.

As indicated in a previous paragraph, the younger Churches are in various stages of development, even in the same country. In the "mission-stage," where the primary emphasis is on evangelism of the non-Christian and the nurture of the infant community of converts, denominationalism has no place whatsoever. One of the important lessons of missionary history is that as evangelists we cannot afford to be denominational. It is in the "Church-stage" of missionary history that

we tend to become conscious of denominational teachings. The evangelist's message is universal; the minister of a Church instructs his congregation concerning the special teachings of his denomination. We look to the ecumenical movement to help ease the transition in our development from the "mission-age" to the "Church-age" — and it seems so clear to us that only if we keep in view the hope of a Church organically one can we effect a right transition from "mission" to "Church."

In South India, for instance, another complication arises. Not only do we have denominational Churches in this area but also a fairly large section of the Eastern Orthodox communion in Travancore, referred to in general as the Syrian Church. They are a sadly divided community. Apart from the Uniat Syrians, there are two main sections of the Syrian Church — the Orthodox Syrian Church and the Mar Thoma Syrian Church. Within the Orthodox Church there are two main parties — the Patriarch's party, which owes allegiance to the Patriarch of Antioch, and the Catholicos' party, which recognises a local Catholicos as its administrative head. Besides, there is a section of members of the Syrian Church which forms part of the Anglican diocese of Travancore and Cochin, which was one of the four dioceses to be included in the Church of South India.

At the time negotiations were started for union in South India, the Mar Thoma Syrians were thinking of joining in the scheme as it took clearer shape. The spread of the ecumenical idea did not only effect a revival of a healthy denominationalism (like everything liable to be abused) but also a new interest in Eastern Orthodox Churches. The many Orthodox communions in Europe and the Middle East were thus quickened to a new sense of importance. And to us of the younger Churches it is very clear that these Orthodox communions will not easily give up their separate identity even within the ecumenical fellowship. In India, on the other hand, it seems unfair to encourage these Orthodox communions of the Syrian Church to persist in division. While enjoying the privileges of ecumenical fellowship on a world-scale as members of the World Council of Churches for instance, yet with studied superiority they keep out of the concrete fellowship of the organic union with the Church of South India. These Syrian Churches would have eventually formed part if it were not for the revived consciousness of separatism that the ecumenical movement has paradoxically enough engendered.

There is one important point concerning the significance of the Ecumenical Movement about which the younger Churches would desire clarification. A good deal of confusion is caused by the easy way in which the term "ecumenical" comes to be applied. Any interdenominational undertaking, for instance, is described frequently as "ecumenical," especially where the project is taken up by several denominations, each retaining its separate identity, and yet all working together for a common end. No one can quarrel with such a use of the term, for it does connote that outlook of fellowship and sense of unity which characterises the coming together of churches of different denominations.

But it is also true that the term "ecumenical" denotes a number of Churches of different lands, each with a culture all its own. So that the world community of Christians in their ecumenical oneness would bring together in multiform grandeur into a single rich mosaic the varied culture-patterns characteristic each of the national and racial groupings into which we Christians of the world would seem to be divided by the very order of creation. To us of the younger Churches the national expression of the common faith is a precious possession. Not a little of our energy in the infant church in our midst is employed in exploring ways and means of making it indigenous to the soil. We hope some day that the younger Churches, each in its own land, will prove worthy of their cultural heritage and national genius.

The ecumenical movement which seeks to unite the Christian peoples of the world into a sense of togetherness ought to be both interdenominational and international. To us of the younger Churches it is the international nature of our faith that strikes the imagination; to you of the older Churches it is the interdenominational character of ecumenical Christianity that compels admiration. After all you do not differ so widely among yourselves culturally, and your present history has drawn you all so much more closely together that there is a vague fear (why not be frank about it?) amongst us of the younger Churches that in a World Council we may lose our national identity and cultural uniqueness, being dominated by the sheer weight of your collective strength and cultural homogeneity.

Perhaps this is one reason why we have greater loyalty and affection for the International Missionary Council than for the World Council of Churches at this stage in the progress of the ecumenical movement. To us it is vital that ecumenical Christianity be both international and

missionary. We are concerned seriously with the fact that church-consciousness and mission-consciousness have not always kept together in the recent development of the older churches. The ecumenical teaching in regard to interdenominational fellowship evokes great enthusiasm. But the challenge of the missionary cause as an ecumenical task does not seem to meet with the same response.

Earlier in this paper reference was made to a signal contribution that the ecumenical movement has made to the younger Churches. It brought us the conviction that the relation between Gospel and Church is not merely consequential, but integral and constitutive (to borrow the telling words of Dr. Hogg). What the ecumenical movement has not yet brought home to the older Churches is this same truth, only expressed in terms of relation between Church and Gospel. Interest in Missions is not derived from enthusiasm for the Church; both proceed from fidelity to the Gospel, the faith once for all committed to the saints.

What has been said so far is nothing new. Many leaders in the older Churches are already conscious that if the ecumenical movement is to make a real impact on the life and thought of Protestant Christendom everywhere, it ought to keep in view the ultimate goal of the organic unity of the Church universal and catholic; it should be increasingly alive to the international and inter-cultural nature of the ecumenical faith as it is to the interdenominational and inter-church nature of the world community of believers; it should quicken ever anew the missionary nature of the faith so that the integral and constitutive nature of the relation between Church and Gospel is pressed home to the Christian conscience.

THE RELEVANCE OF THE GOSPEL TO THE PRESENT TIME

By PIERRE MAURY

THE Gospel message is the life-blood of the Church. Every society draws upon the ideal which it embodies and expresses. In a far deeper sense, Jesus Christ founded the Church to be first of all missionary. Take away the missionary message, and the Church has lost its *raison d'être*.

The proclamation of the message certainly involves the creation of a community. And this community is not merely — like other communities — an association whose members share the same conception of life and conduct. Its very existence constitutes the *mystery* of a supernatural unity, what St. Paul called the "mystery of the Church" (Ephesians 5, 32), the Body of the Christ, risen and seated at the right hand of God. But the life of this Body is continuously maintained by those who are grafted into it, by its new members. The Church is concerned with *all* nations (Matthew 28, 19). Not indeed for reasons of earthly power nor in the proselytising spirit of great human organisations or movements; but because Jesus Christ offers Himself as the Saviour of *all*. He "gathers together in one" (Ephesians 1, 10) in His own person and His own work "all things which are in heaven and on earth." Without the Church's witness, the Lordship of Christ is not exercised according to His will. Unless the good news of Christ is announced *to all*, the world is lost in fatal ignorance and can only follow paths which lead nowhere.

Hence the preaching of the Gospel is the central problem of the Church's life — not a technical problem, but a question of life or death; not a modern problem, but a perennial demand and a perennial difficulty.

This problem involves two equally intrinsic elements: the *truth* or rather the fidelity of the Church's preaching — what the New Testament calls "the uncorruptness and gravity" of "sound speech, that cannot be condemned" (Titus 2, 8) — and its *intelligibility*. Unsound, or in a sealed book, the Gospel is equally idle.

In other words, the Church has to speak about the God of eternity,

and about the age to come, to men who are dwellers in time, living according to the fashion of this transitory world. If the Church has nothing to say about eternity, it had better say nothing at all. And if it speaks about eternity as if it were already there and out of touch with history — no one will listen. In either case Jesus Christ will be betrayed.

Now this two-fold condition represents a two-fold test for the Church; in Bible language a two-fold *temptation*. Sometimes, with its eyes on the age in which its message is given, the Church adapts itself to the present and confines itself to relative truths as ephemeral as the people who hear them. Sometimes, knowing that its message goes beyond the changes and chances of history, the Church talks a "timeless" language which is a foreign tongue to the world, and its message becomes bloodless and abstract. In one case it spoils its preaching with inept apologetics; in the other it dooms itself to cryptic mysteries. (In every age of history it would be easy to illustrate the Church's halting between the two duties laid upon it by God; has it not sometimes been possible to accuse it of Byzantinism — even when it was affirming the eternal nature of the mystery of Jesus Christ over against a perishing world; and at other times to reproach it for such subservience to the age that its message became a "philosophy of enlightenment"?)

Still a clear distinction should be drawn between the two demands which the life of the Church can never escape. These demands are not of equal importance, or rather one is subordinate to the other. In the summary of the Law, the second commandment is like the first and should be equally obeyed, but only on condition that it *follows* the first; in just the same way the Church's preaching is only true to man's need if it is *first* true to Jesus Christ. To man in his concrete situation, the Church tells the truth about himself and his destiny only if it speaks to him about Jesus Christ "the same yesterday and today and for ever" (Heb. 13, 8), i.e. only if its language is not that of "*the present age.*" The Gospel explicitly claims to be "a mystery and a hidden wisdom" which no man knows until there are proclaimed to him things which "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man" (I Cor. 2, 9) — in theological language, to be a *revelation*. Any preaching which discards or discounts this note of its witness is doomed for failure in obedience and loyalty.

But if so, the question suggested by "The Relevance of the Gospel to the Present Time" implies a precise answer. The Church has no

obligation to exhibit, between the present age, modern man and contemporary civilisation and its own message, such harmony and concord as would ease its task in bringing to them the Word of the Gospel. Far from it, the Church must expect that the Gospel — today as always — will proclaim something *different* from what modern man says and demands. Often there will be *contradiction* rather than agreement between the Word of the Church and the words of the world. Just when the Church's message contradicts the thought of modern man, it will really fulfil his deepest expectations. For what man really desires is not what he thinks or imagines that he desires; it is what, according to the will of God, he *needs*. The greatest service that the Church can render will be to tell people not what they can quite well tell themselves, but what they do *not* know and yet unconsciously seek and ensue.

Hence the one problem for the Church, now as always, is to uncover that ignorance of God which the wisdom of the day hides: to witness to that Revelation, foreign to humanity, of which she is the ambassador, in terms as plain, precise and up-to-date as they are strictly faithful to the truth.

What are the truths which the world today repudiates, and the Church must proclaim in language that the world can understand? Evidently those to which the Church has borne witness ever since the days of Christ on earth. For the ways in which men go astray are fundamentally the same, and so is the content of Revelation. There is no more real novelty in heresies and idolatries than in orthodoxy.

This obstinancy of error, and this identity of truth, is briefly comprehended in this, that, while God claims to be adored, loved and served, Himself Alone in what He is, what He has done, what He is doing and will do, the sin of man will always consist in refusing all or part of this adoration, love and service in order to apply them to his own ends. But this self-deification of man takes different shapes at different times, and the Church must penetrate every disguise, so that its eternal message may be God's Word for today.

In our diagnosis, we should not be satisfied with the obvious symptoms of the sickness of society. For instance, man is plainly afraid and in search of security; he is proud of his unprecedented technical achievements and absorbed in his material successes. This being so, it is clear that in proclaiming the goodness of God in creation and redemption — His Providence — or in reminding man that "he does not live by bread alone," the Church will speak to his condition. Never-

theless, the Church needs a deeper reading of present realities if it is to discover afresh and to preach the Christian message in terms of the day.

To me personally it seems that the sin of modern man, and his wretchedness are shown in three special fields: *modern man believes in history, he knows nothing of forgiveness, and is fumbling after a working morality.*

It is to this man, the worshipper of his special idols and the victim of his own illusions and terrors, that the Church must speak about the God Who throws down idols and frees men from despair and from death. As the Church has never any other message than the name of Jesus Christ, we may say that today it must publish His name as *Judge, Saviour* and *Lord.*

Modern Man's Faith in History and Christ the Judge of History.

The signs of modern man's blind confidence in history are manifest. At one and the same time he imagines that he is making history and knows that he is determined by history. Thus the pride, typical of our epoch, is matched only by its fatalism. People talk about creating a new civilisation, even a new humanity different from any hitherto known, and yet feel helpless to avert the destruction of the human race by their technical inventions. For example, it is striking to see side by side, sometimes in the same person, the basic optimism of the communist and the apocalyptic terror inspired by atomic power. Thus our civilisation sways between the intoxication of its own creative power, and craven surrender to extinction by the work of its own hands.

But a deeper uncertainty underlies this paradoxical inner conflict. *Above all our world suffers from having no Judge.* To give worth to its efforts and its destiny it has nothing but itself. It is only from an earthly future that it expects any verdict on the present. So a master of French politics entitles his diagnosis of the contemporary scene, "History will judge" — a standard formula for the modern mind. Pragmatism of the nursery! Historical results can furnish no yardstick. First because "results" imply some external measure of their creative value. Even so, their value vanishes in the evolutionary process in which they occur. No effort can be warranted by its success, for success is relative to the judgment which assesses it; and no success is the last of the series. The recognition that progress is a myth has long ago taught us that trust in the verdict of history is an illusion. But our age, though it no longer

believes that evolution is necessarily beneficent, is more than any other age subject to the fascination of the future. In the depths of its spirit, it is stirred by Messianic hopes; its eyes are always on the future, not only to quicken its activities but as the sole reward of toil.

There are two catches in this relative thinking. First selflessness little short of absolute is demanded of the individual. The makers of history are never to hear the verdict, which will be delivered when they are in their graves. That is not the worst. If nothing but history is real, then there will be no verdict at all. History cannot cry Finis to itself, and the human adventure indefinitely prolonged has no goal and therefore no sense. The astringent wisdom of the Preacher proclaiming the vanity of all which ends only to begin over again was not "new under the sun." What marks our age is the blind folly of its ambitions and dreams. The Great White Throne was for Western Civilisation until the nineteenth century a certainty: in the Middle Ages an obsession. It therefore had a standard of moral judgment as well as hope and a mission in life. Our age has no rules left, and no real trust in the future.

It is this modern man, the victim of his own vain trust in History, that the Church addresses. It can only meet this idolatry by preaching this essential element of the Christian message: *the world and history have an end:* they are moving towards it as well as limited by it. And this *end* is not a date like any other — the end of the world, the last event in history. It is a *verdict* pronounced by the ever-transcendent Creator of the universe. History judges nothing; it is subject to its Judge. History will be stopped one day, not by arriving at its end, but by the decree of Another. This is what we are told by the Preacher at the end of his lucid, sceptical confession. His real meaning is shown in the last verse of his book: "Fear God, and keep His commandments: for this is the whole duty of man. For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." (Eccles. 12, 13–14).[1]

In order to preach this message, the Church is not called upon to elaborate philosophies of history. These would be just as arbitrary — even if they called themselves Christian — as when they are invented by experts who take no account of God. Nor should the Church preach a Gospel of the Beyond, which disparages human history and its vicissitudes. Above all, it should not promise compensation in heaven for

[1] It is interesting to note that when Paul wanted to preach the Gospel to the pagan Athenians, he spoke to them *first* about God's judgment in Christ (Acts 17, 31).

the miseries of earth; Eternity, thought of as a reward or as an indemnity, would be only a vain extension of the vanity of Time.

The Church must re-learn the meaning of History. This means that it must first of all heed everything that happens in time and treat it seriously, from the most trivial events to sweeping collective movements, from personal decisions of faith or scepticism to the great battles which the Church has had to fight. "*God* will bring every work into judgment." But above all the Church must announce God's activity in history, which in Jesus Christ and His Incarnation gives Time its divine value. The Church must also respect history, because it knows that since the Death, Resurrection and Ascension of Jesus Christ the meaning of every period of history has become clear (has been "fulfilled" to use the language of the Bible), and now the world only awaits the visible manifestation of this fulfilment. We have arrived at the final stage of history. We are living in "the last days" (Heb. 9, 26; I Cor. 10, 11; I Pet. 1, 20). Hence our attitude to history is that of *expectancy,* watchful, active and ardent; expectancy of History's final goal.

More than this, the Church, aware that it is living in "these last days," must speak in a way apt to this particular epoch: and this epoch is the interval between the Ascension of Jesus Christ to the right hand of God and His return in glory. The Church always expresses the same truth; but not always in the same way at all times. The Prophets of the Old Testament and the Apostles of the New say the same thing of Christ, who is the same yesterday and today and for ever (Heb. 13, 8), but not from the same angle. So the Church today must preach the same message as ever, but matched to the hour. What distinctive features of this "Interval" mark its basic difference from other ages? Let us say simply that the Gospels (Matthew 24 and parallel passages) specify outwardly an increase of great catastrophes (wars and cosmic cataclysms of a more and more terrible nature), and within the Church an increase in infidelity and apostasy, and love grown cold; but at the same time they foretell that the Church, even though greatly reduced in strength (Matt. 24, 12–14), will be more missionary than ever (Matt. 28, 19). Then the Church must neither be surprised at its own apparent failure nor discouraged; on the contrary, it will be the time for sure hope and watchful expectation; the time of the antichrists, but also the time immediately preceding the glorious and unmistakable return of the Son of God.

The fact that the Church of today is speaking during this particular

period of history ought to give her message a special emphasis and certainty. She should be fearless when everything seems to deny and to repudiate her message.

The Church must therefore preach the truth of the Bible eschatology — in a way suited to the times. Thus the message will assume an urgency and effect which it has too often lost. Thus she will preach with confidence and hope. And thus without artifice or accommodation to human ideas, she will meet the real desires, unavowed and often unconscious, of modern man. For if modern man no longer dreams of Paradise Lost but of a future Golden Age, it is because without this future he has nothing left to choose, to do or to expect. It has often been noted that the main attraction of the totalitarian mysticisms, especially the mysticism of Communism, is found in the promises which it makes to the men of today. Those who understand this tremendous modern religion best are clear that it is the idealism of historic materialism (though the contradiction in terms is formal) which gives it its drive. Only a Christian eschatology, quiet and confident, can stand up to this Messianism, can make life worth living again for the prisoners of a hope which is mundane and built on sand.[2]

This is not the time or place to recall the central elements of this Christian eschatology. We shall merely say that it must be expressly *totalitarian* and not individualistic, it must be cosmic and not tepidly humanist. The return of Christ to judge the living and the dead, and by His verdict to inaugurate the Kingdom of God, must be trumpeted with all St. Paul and St. John's glory in the splendour of Christ, the Christ by Whom and for Whom *all things* were made. On these heights any pettiness, any Churchiness becomes impossible, and the actual relations between the Church and the world can be made clear. Eschatology (and not any doctrine concerning the Orders of Creation) is the one thing which can restore the Church's freedom in face of the world, and its sure expectation that this world will be brought to judgment.

Modern Man's Ignorance of Forgiveness and Jesus Christ Our Saviour.

It is not surprising that modern man, who places his faith in history, repudiates the idea of *forgiveness*. For history does not forgive. History

[2] I recall the significant revolt of a young Communist who protested only against one of my Christian affirmations, that of the Last Judgment. "By what right do you dare to announce this event," he said, "which if it took place would change the whole of ethics and the whole of human faith?"

deals with what *has happened* and is therefore beyond repair and pardon. Hence those who place their confidence in history alone can no longer grasp the essentially Christian reality of the *remission of sins*. From this it follows that the tragic motif of our atheistic age turns about *an unsatisfied need for justification.*

In every age, indeed, man has refused to be a "miserable sinner." In every age the "hatred of grace" — the true form of original sin — flares up in man's passionate desire to assert his innocence as well as his rights. In every age man repeats, like Adam, "It is not my fault," thus showing that self-justification is the very heart of sin. And in every age this assertion of one's own integrity is naturally paired with imputations against others (Adam accuses Eve, Eve accuses the serpent). Excusing one's self always leads to accusing others. . . . But this permanent tendency in human nature appears today in a special form.[3]

First, it is no longer exclusively or chiefly related to the individual obsessed by personal failure. It is expressed in the public utterances of parties, nations and classes. For instance, it is significant that the Communist religion loudly proclaims the moral *innocence* of the proletariat and the impeccability, even the infallibility, of the "Party" and at the same time it persistently assails other economic systems and other classes, conveniently regarded as incarnate in America or some other nation. Our age is relentless in the hunt for scapegoats. Hitler's anti-Semitism is only the most monstrous example. But, underneath the surface of his self-justification, modern man — including the Communist — believes in his own natural goodness. According to him the imperfections of civilisation (suffering, injustice, war) are entirely due to non-human factors, such as the uneven distribution of wealth.

This feature of our age should not surprise us. It always emerges when calamities and impending disaster come to disturb man's naïve confidence in his own powers. And the stresses of our civilisation may be measured by the violence of the reproaches hurled at one another by parties, races, nations and classes.

Nor need we wonder that modern irreligion often takes the form of an accusation directed first against God and secondly against the Church. When the atheist repeats, "if there were a God . . ." or "i

[3] This revolt against the idea of sin, this assertion of innocence, has never been expressed more violently nor more logically than by Nietzsche (for instance "Sin, the supreme form of the corruption of humanity." *The Anti-Christ,* fragment 49). It is indispensable to read and meditate upon this brilliant forerunner of modern thought, if we want to understand contemporary Western civilisation, which derives most of its main ideas from Nietzsche.

is the Church's fault," he is really asserting his own innocence and trying to believe in it.

But the misery, and doubtless the real agony, of this man is that, for all his imputations against others, he does not succeed in reassuring himself. The more he proclaims his innocence, the less he succeeds in convincing himself of it; so that our time has been called with some justice "the age of the guilty conscience."[4]

In face of this tragedy, what should be the message of the Church? First, and above all, the Church must cease to be "conformed to this world" (Romans 12, 2), as too often in the past two centuries, by allowing itself (more or less consciously) to water down the essentials of the biblical Revelation. The Church must give up confusing evil with imperfection, and sin with mistakes and weakness. It must cease from turning salvation into a merely ethical problem, the problem of "right action"; and it must give up every kind of justification by works — those types of Christian atheism and of man's uneasy impiety. In other words the Church must admit God's *accusation against* man, and against herself first. The Church must not try to justify herself by citing her virtues and successes, or by blaming the sin and incredulity of the world.

But this "fear of the Lord, which is the beginning of wisdom" for the Church (Psalm 111, 10), this humility in which it should live and speak, is no adequate definition of her present duty of witness. The Church must learn once again to speak of *free pardon*. For it is futile, nay harmful, for the Church to speak of sin against God unless it also speaks of the *forgiveness of this sin*. It is futile, nay harmful, for it to speak of the insulted righteousness of God unless it also speaks of His justification freely offered. One of the Church's gravest mistakes is undoubtedly to *preach about sin* before proclaiming the remission of sins; in theological terms to *preach the Law before the Gospel*. By this fault the Church lays itself open to all kinds of misunderstanding and provokes nothing but indifference or rebellion.

Thus, as in all great epochs of its history, the Church fulfils her responsibility only by proclaiming *before all* else Christ Jesus and Him crucified. This is the Church's responsibility; it is also her only chance

[4] For instance, it is striking to read the last letters written by French Communists who were shot during the Resistance. With impressive monotony they all repeat in effect "I have nothing to reproach myself with. I die with my head high . . ." I do not know of any more harrowing confession of inward anguish than these letters. — In the same way the whole of "existentialist" literature fails to conceal this fear. The doctrine of "the absurd" i.e. life has no meaning at all, is only a supreme effort at self-justification for a life which is falling in ruins.

of making herself heard and believed. For outside the Church who proclaims to modern man, tormented by his guilty conscience, God's offer of forgiveness? Who else offers this forgiveness in its reality, as the end of the guilt from which modern man is trying in vain to struggle free, as the opportunity to begin life completely afresh and to have real peace within? Who else offers this deliverance either to individuals or to nations? The world's crown of sorrows lies in the fact that no word is heard of God's forgiveness — nor of man's forgiveness of man. Hence the violence and despair which overwhelm men's lives and bedevil their relations. Hence also the impossibility of any real justice. For justice can never be restored if it is conceived as nothing more than a perpetual balancing of accounts.

But if this message of *God's righteousness* is to be heard (that righteousness which justifies through forgiveness in Jesus Christ), the Church must not utter stereotyped and unintelligible formulas. It must constantly re-learn the concrete content of the promise made by Jesus: *"Seek ye first the Kingdom of Heaven and its righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you"* (Matt. 6, 33). The Church must not believe in this promise alone: but it must really believe in it.

The Search for an Ethic. Jesus Christ is Lord.

This brings us to the third subject which must be included in the teaching of the Church today: the moral teaching for which our modern world is seeking and hoping.

The signs of this search are obvious. Far from making us doubt it, the moral chaos in which we live should, on the contrary, be regarded as the visible evidence of this need. For it is not only the grim consequence of the cataclysm of the two world wars. It is the child of the earthquake that has shattered civilisation itself.

It may perhaps be said with truth that the end of the age of individualism has brought with it the end of the individualist ethic typical of that age, and has revealed the need for a social morality. The bourgeois of the 18th and 19th centuries saw his duties as almost exclusively concerned with personal relationships. They demanded primarily personal honesty, charity and morality. Social conditions, political attitudes, international relations did not belong to the sphere of ethical obligation. This limitation of morality to private life led on the one hand, in the secular world, to the actual denial of moral obligation (the inevitable result of the unconscious egoism of bourgeois civilisa-

tion), and on the other hand in Christian thought to a more or less puritanical pietism. The birth of a collective age or, to put it briefly, "the birth of the masses" (according to Ortega y Gasset's classical phrase) has forced on our attention the problem of social justice and, above all, the moral problem raised by the existence of the proletariat. Thus the demand for a wider code of ethics has been born again in the modern conscience.

But as the range of ethics has been extended the *absolute validity* of ethical standards has been called in question. Not only have the world deluges which have not yet abated undermined the belief of modern man in the existence of permanent, indubitable "values," and in the possibility of applying them to a reality which appears too complex or too recalcitrant; but the reactionary or revolutionary philosophies of power have led him to regard success as the one and only moral touchstone. "The end justifies the means." This old adage has come to be the accepted wisdom of the greatest movements of our time. It is a fatal one: for when the means are morally indifferent, the end itself cannot preserve the sanctity ascribed to it.

But here again we discover the same inner tragedy which we noted above. Modern amoralism does not satisfy those who profess it. Never have moral professions been so frequent Every political speech smacks of a sermon. Every international discussion stalks behind the swelling phrases of the Pharisee. Doubtless despair (which is universally recognised as the dominant note of our generation) throws into relief this vast masquerade. Man today longs for the "good" life; he longs for society to be "just," for the nations to cease doing "evil" to one another. He longs for all this. But he no longer believes that these ideals can be real.

What message should the Church give in the midst of this moral yearning, chaos and despair? It is lost labour sadly to bemoan the evils of the time. The Church has too often believed that the sternness of its message consisted in enumerating — with sorrow or anger — the wickednesses of the world, or in exhausting itself in moral exhortation. Needless to say, also, the message of the Church in this sphere would be completely irrelevant and idle if it confined itself — through timidity or acquiescence — to reciting the precepts of individualist morals, on the pretext that no collective change is possible, valid or real, without an individual change of heart.

Here again the Church must learn to "discern the signs of the times"

and "to judge the spirits" (Matthew 16, 3; I Cor. 12, 10), i.e. to recognise, even in the miseries, revolts or nightmares of the world, an urgent appeal that it should be true, in its preaching, to the Gospel of God.

Again, it is impossible here even to sketch what would have to be included today in a code in tune with the biblical revelation. But bearing in mind what has been said, we would point out that this ethic must be:

(a) An ethic which is *true to history,* i.e. true to the *whole of life,* both individual and collective, taking full account of the whole of concrete reality, and giving this reality the importance conferred on it by the "creation of all things in Christ Jesus" (Col. 1, 16) and the incarnation of Christ — but equally true to *the end of History,* that is, to Christian eschatology.

(b) An ethic which is *true to the demands of justice,* both individual and collective, manifested by the uneasy conscience of modern man; but which is also true to *that other limit* set by Divine Justification to any claim of man to be able to fulfil the demands of absolute morality: i.e. a personal and social ethic which has a place for *free pardon:* God's forgiveness of man and man's of men.

This specific declaration on moral questions is doubtless the point at which the Church encounters the greatest difficulty in making its message acceptable or even intelligible to the world. In order to overcome this difficulty, the Church needs both courage and vision. It must realise that it will always be accused either of Bolshevism or craven conservatism. It will be criticised by turns as other-worldly and as this-worldly. And above all, it will be criticised for those Christian reservations, which make it impossible to propose for this world an ideal which is final, practicable and adequate. But this difficulty and these criticisms should not deter the Church from endeavouring patiently to discover and to uphold the concrete forms of society in which the outward *signs* of the Lordship of Christ should be visible.

The ethic preached by the Church will never consist of anything but provisional rules, applicable to a transitory world. This ethic will always be characterised, in a double sense, by its *expectancy of the Kingdom;* negatively by rejecting the dream of an ideal to be realised here below; positively, by affirming that, faith in the coming of the Kingdom is not really faith unless it changes the conduct of those who are sure of its coming. In other words, the ethic preached by the Church

will be equally far removed from the dream of a Christian civilisation identified with the Kingdom of God, and from a religion which retires from the world and passively hopes for a heaven reserved for the blessed.

In these remarks we have often used the expression "the Message of the Church." Of course, this includes both the spoken message and the message "incarnate" in the life of the Church and in that of each of its members. It is only too evident that the reason why people do not believe what the Church *says* is often due to what the Church *does,* and especially to the undeniable ineffectiveness of its message upon its own members. What is the use of the Church speaking, if people can always point to the contrast between "the worth of Christianity and the unworthiness of Christians" (Berdiaeff); if they can mock at the spectacle of a Church entrenched in private piety, afraid to venture out on the quest for a social morality, mumbling formulas without experiencing the joy and power they contain; if people can point on the one hand to divisions within the Church tolerated with an easy conscience simply because they are inherited from the past, and on the other hand, to the ignorance of an indifference towards *the real Christian significance* of those questions on which the great Christian confessions have taken their stand in opposition to one another; above all to the spectacle of so many parishes which are incapable of being real *communities* and are divided by internal differences, selfishness and political and social distinctions stronger than their professed unity.

In conclusion let me say that, if these are some of the features of the Church's message for the world today, and if the "relevance" of this message to the world is this *contradiction* between the "present age" and the "age to come," the Church must not expect its message to meet with much success. But the modesty of its earthly hopes should not discourage the Church. For when the Church puts its trust in its own earthly succeess, it is really playing a losing game. The Lord of the Church did not promise the little flock that when He returned He "would find faith on earth" (Luke 18, 8). But seeing that the Church has sure and certain hope for the future of the whole world, its message will always be "good news." And, until the end, there will always be some who are ready to listen to it as the good news for all men. Jesus Christ Himself has promised it (Matthew 16, 18; 24, 12–14).

THE CHURCH OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

By CLARENCE T. CRAIG

WHEN the man of today hears the word "church," it awakens in his mind a wide variety of images. Some think at once of a *building,* ornate or simple, where the worship of God is celebrated. But the early Christians were groups without legal rights to possess institutional property. Amid the ruins of war-torn cities many modern Christians are discovering anew that the Church is not made of stone or brick. The living stones of the true Temple of God are those who worship him in Spirit and in truth.

Others think of a denominational or territorial body. There are Methodist and Lutherans; Eastern Orthodox and Baptists; the Church of England and of Sweden. All of these names would have been equally strange to the first Christians. More than that, since the Church was by definition the people of God, there could not possibly be more than one. There could not be a Jewish Church and a Gentile Church, or a Macedonian Church and a Judean. Christ had broken down the dividing wall of hostility and made of the different peoples one new man.[1] In Christ all human distinctions were abolished.[2] As there was one God and one Lord and one faith and one baptism, there could only be one Church.[3]

Others think of a congregation of like-minded men and women who band themselves together to worship God in the way they choose. Of course the New Testament can use the word for the Christians living in one place,[4] and even for small house communities.[5] But these were not groups which had been formed according to the pattern of other social clubs and religious societies. Believers had been called out by God, called into a society which he had created. They were the Elect, the Chosen. This was not their own doing, but it rested in the purpose of God who sought a People for himself.

I

If we are to understand the nature of the Church we must begin with the Old Testament. According to Acts 7.38 there was already a church in the wilderness when God redeemed his people out of Egypt. Terms

like new Israel and "Israel of God" would be pointless except against the background of a nation which had been so conceived as the people of God.[6] If Christians were the "true circumcision"[7] and the "real sons of Abraham"[8] this Old Testament background is presupposed. A people of a New Covenant presupposed an Old Covenant. The Greek work *ekklesia* has no special religious connotation, as its use within the New Testament for a political assembly shows.[9] It had acquired such significance because of its use in the Septuagint to translate *Kahal*. This was the term for the people of Israel, called out in solemn assembly, or ideally considered as such.

When the word *ekklesia* is used in the New Testament it is with conscious reference to this Old Testament conception. One can hardly say, therefore, that Jesus founded the Church. The truth rather is that he redeemed the Church. For centuries there had been a people who looked upon themselvs as set apart for God. When Christians applied the term *ekklesia* to themselves they redefined the people of God in terms of the new acts of God for their redemption. It was not to be identified with Israel after the flesh, but with individuals from every tribe, nation, people, and tongue.[10] Its adherents were not those who were strictly loyal to Torah, for Christ was the end of the law.[11] Its center was not in a Temple where sacrifices were continually offered, but in Christ who had died for their sins and been raised by God from the dead.[12] Though membership in the people of God was determined by different criteria the basic conception of a Church goes back to the Old Testament. The true Remnant about which the prophets had spoken, had found fulfillment in the Christian community.

II

The gospels clearly indicate that the central message of Jesus did not deal with the Church. It was concerned with *the kingdom of God* and the repentance which was necessary if men should enter it by the gracious mercy of God.[13] Jesus announced the nearness of the kingdom of God, a message which gave tremendous urgency to his ethical demands. A crisis was at hand; men must stand ready to pay any price to enter God's kingdom.[14] Its approaching cónsummation meant the resurrection and the judgment, in other words, God's salvation.

But the message of Jesus did not deal exclusively with future events. The rule of God was already *present in his own ministry*. His healings and especially the demon exorcisms were evidence of the dawning

powers of the new age.[15] For those who had eyes to see, the mysterious presence of the kingdom of God was already manifest. The salvation of God had already appeared in the gracious work of Jesus.[16] To reject him was to refuse that salvation, for Jesus embodied the kingdom in his own person.[17]

Most startling was his announcement concerning *those who would enter* the kingdom when it should come in its fulness. It would not be for the rich but for the poor.[18] It would not be for the wise scribes but for the little children and the childlike.[19] It would not be for the righteous Pharisees but for the tax-collectors and sinners who were more ready to repent.[20] These were the groups which responded to the message of Jesus, and to them he gave assurance, "Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom."[21]

Did the message of Jesus deal specifically with the Church? Biblical students are still far from agreement on the question. It is not to be solved simply by a discussion of the authenticity of the two passages in which Matthew employs *ekklesia*.[22] It is the idea, not the term which is crucial. Neither 1 Peter nor the Gospel of John uses the word *ekklesia* yet they are both documents which accord high importance to the Church. Certainly Jesus promised entrance to the kingdom of God to those who sincerely responded to his call. He gathered a group of disciples about him. He did not form them into separate synagogues, but his disciples attended the appointed Jewish services. They had no separate cult acts during his life-time. Yet, since they were destined to enter the kingdom of God, were they not already the Church, whether gospel passages use that term or not?

Certainly in those who responded to the call of Jesus we find another part of the *background* for the Church. But many interpreters believe that it is inadmissable to apply the term with reference to that time. They believe that the passages which speak of the presence of the kingdom of God all refer to the activity of Jesus and that none relate this presence to the disciples. Other interpreters believe that this is quite accidental in the preservation of the tradition. They hold that since the Church is the anticipation in the present of the kingdom of God those who were prepared to enter belonged to the Church even during the life-term of Jesus.

III

No one can doubt, however, that *the resurrection of Jesus* was cen

tral for the Church of the New Testament. Those who believed that God had raised Christ from the dead comprised the Church. God had vindicated his Messiah and the time of redemption had begun. With his resurrection, the New Age was already manifesting its power. Without that resurrection there was no full salvation because it was the ground for the resurrection of believers from the dead. We may say that the Christian Church was the community which had been constituted by God through the resurrection of Jesus.

A further indispensable mark of this community was its possession by the Holy Spirit. The gift of the Spirit had been promised for the end time. When the early Christians interpreted their ecstasy and joy and peace as caused by the Spirit, they meant that this had already come.[23] The risen Christ had sent them the Spirit, the guarantee of his coming in glory. Though Christian tradition has followed Luke in dating the first experience of the Spirit fifty days after the crucifixion, John's Gospel puts this on the day of the resurrection.[24] That symbolizes the fact that belief in the resurrection and possession by the Spirit are twin signs for the identification of the Church.

The sharing by believers in the blessings of God was expressed through the word *Koinonia*. Recent research has made it clear that when this word is followed by the genitive it should be translated not as "fellowship" but as "participation" or "sharing."[25] The Church was a *koinonia* because its members participated in the same gifts. Sometimes the gift is Christ;[26] sometimes the Spirit;[27] sometimes God himself.[28] Since these were experiences which they shared in common there was a *koinonia* with one another.[29] This led to financial sharing within the brotherhood.[30] Those who participated in the same spiritual blessings also shared their material resources. But there is no evidence that the word was ever used as a name for the group.

Yet many different terms were used. The author of 1 Peter addressed his readers as "A chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God's own people."[31] A whole series of Old Testament descriptions of Israel are thus applied to the Church. In the Gospel of John we read of the one flock in which Christ's sheep are united. Yet there are different folds. The farewell prayer of Christ is for the unity of all those who believe through the word preached by the disciples.[32] Believers are the branches of the one true vine.[33] They can find their unity in him, for apart from him they can do nothing. To be in Christ, the crucified and risen Lord, is to be in the Church.

IV

Entrance to the Church was by *faith and baptism.* Faith was more than accepting the truth of the Christian message. It involved repentance and a committal of life to the God who had raised Christ from the dead; it called for a dedication to Christ as the Lord of their lives; it was possible through the gift which God bestowed through his Spirit; it was the experience in which the redeeming grace of God laid hold on the individual and incorporated him into the body of Christ. Jesus had called for a similar faith, but during his ministry he had not baptized. Very early, his Church practiced baptism into the name of Jesus as the seal of this experience. It is not strange, therefore, that water and the Spirit are associated over and over again with entrance into the Christian life.

The life of this brotherhood in Christ was nourished by the celebration of *the Lord's Supper.* A common meal was the high point of their worship. It served to commemorate the Last Supper which Jesus had celebrated with his disciples, when by parabolic action and significant words he had pointed to his redemptive death;[34] the meal looked forward to their reunion with him in the banquet of the kingdom of God.[35] But it likewise served to realize his presence as the unseen host. "The cup of blessings which we break, is it not a participation in the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a participation in the body of Christ?"[36] Or, as another New Testament writer put it, Christ gave them in himself nothing less than the bread of life.[37]

The New Testament Church was preeminently *a witnessing community,* for its members were under obligation to proclaim the word of God and live in obedience to him. They were stewards of the mysteries of God, ambassadors of his reconciliation.[38] The good news of his salvation was not to be enjoyed in quiet satisfaction. The risen Christ had called them to be his witnesses to the end of the earth.[39] Not only did an apostle like Paul respond to that summons. He rejoiced that his converts had sounded forth the word of the Lord wherever they had gone.[40] The urgency of their missionary zeal was intensified because they were convinced that the time was very short.

The New Testament Church looked forward eagerly to the speedy consummation of the kingdom of God. They had already experienced a real salvation in Christ. The man who was in Christ was a new creation and already walked in newness of life through the Spirit. The

Fourth Gospel goes so far as to say that the believer already possessed eternal life through knowledge of the one true God in his Son. But the powers of evil had not yet been finally overcome. Believers lived in anticipation of the completion of God's reign. There was continuity between the Church on earth and the new age of God, but these were not the same. The city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem lay beyond the coming resurrection.[41] The Christ who now ruled in his Church would ultimately reign as King of kings and Lord of lords.[42]

V

Words are preserved in the gospels which indicate that there was contention over leadership within the Church.[43] Jesus made it clear that there was no place for lordship among his disciples. Preeminence comes only through humble service. As he himself had been the supreme Servant, those whom he sends forth as heralds of God's saving grace are to be servants of others. The touchstone of a truly *apostolic* ministry is to be found here. Minister and servant are alternative translations of the Greek.

The various ministraties which developed in the early Church were due to differing endowments by the Spirit. All were gifts of God to his Church. Foremost among these was that of the *apostles.*[44] An apostle was one who had seen the risen Lord;[45] that distinction was not communicable to anyone else. The twelve were included among these, for the risen Christ had appeared to that group.[46] That number had been chosen by Jesus from his disciples with reference to the eschatological kingdom.[47] Only twelve could sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. But there were other apostles whom the risen Christ sent forth as missionaries and these were accorded the same authority.[48]

Working with the apostles were *prophets and teachers,* the other ministers of the Word. The preaching of the gospel was the supreme function. In addition, there were those who possessed *gifts of healing* and who performed other services to the community. Since all believers shared in the priesthood and Christ was the great high priest in Heaven[49] there was no place in the New Testament for ministers who should bear the title of priest. There was need for men in various administrative capacities. In many places in the New Testament these bear no specific title.[50] Only once does Paul refer to bishops and deacons.[51] In the Acts of the Apostles, elders are mentioned in connection

with some of the communities[52] and this term is used in other New Testament writings.[53] Ultimately the Church was to develop an administrative hierarchy of bishop, elders, and deacons, but this is not found within the New Testament, which prescribes no one particular pattern of administration.

Was there a single central authority within the primitive Church? How was their unity to find expression amid scattered communities? There is some evidence that Jerusalem tried to exercise a supervisory relationship over the rest of the churches.[54] There can be no question that James, the brother of Jesus, held a unique position of leadership there.[55] As independent an apostle as Paul showed a surprising deference to James, and he raised an offering for the saints at Jerusalem even from poverty-stricken Macedonian churches.[56] Among the Twelve Peter was clearly the leader. Since he was the first to whom the risen Christ appeared there was real support for those who ascribed the primacy to him.[57] But the New Testament clearly indicates that he did not exercise ultimate authority.[58] That rested only in the living Christ, who is present where two or three are gathered together in his name.[59] The leadership of the Church depended then as now upon those whom he calls.

VI

The nature of the Church is not determined by any form of organisation. It is determined by the relation of a community to Christ. He alone is the Head of the Church and he alone has the right to rule. This is set forth in the New Testament in three figures which express what the Church ought to be if it is the true Church.

First, it is a *building* built in the one foundation, Jesus Christ. Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid in Jesus Christ.[60] The various stones are fitted into that one building.[61] This is not an outward structure but the *Temple* in which God dwells[62] and of which he is the builder. The Temple at Jerusalem might be destroyed,[63] but the new Temple which replaced it was the Church. God did not dwell in a place but in a people, a people who rested on Christ as their foundation.

The second figure is that of the Church as the Bride of Christ.[64] That symbolized two things, its obedience and its purity. The author of Ephesians did not think in terms of a democratic marriage nor of a patriarchal home. Though we may not agree with the figure that is

used we can agree upon the importance of the Church's obedience to Christ. Christ had cleansed the Church that she might be "holy and without blemish." "The saints" is one of the most frequent names for Christians in the New Testament; the conception is epitomized in the phrase of the creed, "I believe in the Holy Church." But this holiness did not mean that all of the members of the Church were perfect individually. Many weeds were to be found among the wheat,[65] and our records of the apostolic Church bear eloquent testimony to the weakness and failure of the first followers of Jesus. But the Church in which we believe is the pure bride of Christ, the holy community of the people of God.

The most important of the figures is that of *the Body of Christ*. When in the Fourth Gospel it is said that the body of Christ will replace the temple which the Jews will destroy, this may refer to the Church as well as to the risen presence of Jesus. But it is Paul who develops the figure most fully, and it is with his application that one must be concerned in trying to understand its meaning. It is easy to repeat the phrase without taking the metaphor seriously. Though we may not think so realistically as a man of the first century, we may still find important teaching in this figure. If the Church is the Body of Christ it tells us three definite things about its nature.

VII

a) First, a body provides a vivid expression of *unity amid diversity*.[66] Paul elaborated this insight in the twelfth chapter of his first letter to Corinth. A body has many members and these have different functions. Yet it needs them all if it is to be truly a body. Modern ingenuity has gone far in supplying substitutes for hands and feet which have been lost in battle or by accident, but this only emphasizes how much we need them all. A body is a whole which needs all of its differing parts.

The bearing of this on the separativeness of our denominations and national churches should be obvious. Since the members are not alike, they dare not remain apart else the wholeness of the body will not find expression. Only blind bigotry can make the intolerant claim that because the hand is not the eye therefore it is no part of the body. In the Creed we express our belief in the *Catholic* Church. Since that means *wholeness* the true Church will find its unity not by uniformity

but in the midst of diversity. If the apostolic Church could include within its frame-work so divergent interpretations as that of Paul, for whom Christ was the end of the law, and that of Matthew, for whom Christ was a new law-giver, there must be a place within the Church of today for similar variety in expression. That inheres in the very nature of a body.

b) A second function of every body is to be *the agency* for the visible expression of the soul or spirit. We should not be diverted by details of psychological terminology. All that is meant is that though the person is not identifiable with the body, he cannot be identified without it. This truth may become more vivid to us if we distinguish a body from a corpse and a ghost. A corpse weighs as much as the body, but it no longer expresses "the spirit of the departed." A ghost is a spirit which by definition has no effective embodiment in the world of time and space.

If the Church is the body of Christ, this recognizes the fact that he cannot be fully operative in our world as a disembodied spirit. His spirit must act through some bodily expression if its existence is to be manifest. The Church is the indispensable organ through which Christ makes his life effective in the world. Naturally God is not limited in the way that men are limited by their bodily organism. Certainly the risen Christ can never be completely contained within any ecclesiastical institution. But if the Church is the Body of Christ, it is where his Spirit is effective.[67]

This figure should help us identify the Church. If it is the Body of Christ no outward forms can guarantee the Church's presence. An institution may become a corpse from which the true spirit of Christ has departed. That possibility should not lead to charges against members of the Body whose polity and forms of worship differ from our own. It should awaken the deepest heart-searching within every branch of his Church. The real Body of Christ is the agency which incarnates his Spirit and incorporates his life.

c) A third analogy is to be found in that a body is an *organism which develops by transformation from within.* A building may increase in size as separate bricks are laid on one another. But a body does not grow by adding fixed and separate parts. It grows as new material is taken up into the organism and made part of an interesting whole. When Paul called Christ "the head of the body," he may have thought of that part as directing growth.[68] Though our conceptions of bi-

ology are quite different, we may still appreciate what the New Testament was endeavoring to express. If the Church is the Body of Christ, he is the inner principle of growth. Growth comes not through external addition but through inner transformation by him, as believers are made new creatures in him.

If the members thus become parts of one body, the result must follow that all are affected by what happens to any part. An injury to a man's arm has an effect on the whole organism. If the Church *is* the Body of Christ, it should be impossible for members in one part of the world to be afflicted without intense pain to the rest. Members that belong to the same body will suffer together and rejoice together.[69] If this is not the case, that member is either paralyzed or is already cut off.

The Church of the New Testament considered itself to be the heir of the promises of God in the Old Testament and the foretaste of a new humanity. It was the community of those who looked to Christ as their risen Lord and Savior. He was the Rock upon which they were built and the Head into which they grew. It was a community marked by the gifts and the power of the Holy Spirit. Those who participated in these blessings shared with each other for they were part of the same body, the body of Christ. This community had been entrusted with the gospel of God's salvation, the word of his wisdom and power. Men and women entered this society on the call of God by faith and baptism. Their lives were strengthened as they partook of the Lord's Supper. Against that fellowship the powers of death have been without avail for the struggling church militant looks forward to the Church Triumphant which is the Kingdom of God.

REFERENCES

1. Eph. 2.14.
2. Col. 3.11–12.
3. Eph. 4.4–5; 1.23; 2.16.
4. I Cor. 4.17.
5. Rom. 16.5.
6. Gal. 6.16.
7. Phil. 3.3.
8. Rom. 4.16; Gal. 3.29.
9. Acts 19. 32; 39–40.
10. Rev. 7.9. etc.
11. Rom. 10.4.
12. I Cor. 15.3 ff.
13. Mark 1.14–15.
14. Luke 14.25–33.
15. Matt. 12.28.
16. Matt. 11.2–6.
17. Mark 8.38.
18. Luke 6.20 ff.
19. Mark 10.14–15.
20. Matt. 21.31.
21. Luke 12.32.
22. Matt. 16.18; 18.17.
23. Acts 2.16 ff.
24. John 20.22.
25. J. Y. Campbell, "Koinonia and its Cognates in the New Testament," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LI, 352–80; H. Seeseman, *Der Begriff Koinonia im N.T.* (1933); F. Hauck in *Theologisches Woerterbuch zum N.T.*, III, 804 f.
26. I Cor. 1.9.
27. II Cor. 13.13.
28. I John 1.3.
29. I John 1.7.
30. Acts 2.44–45; II Cor. 8.9.
31. I Pet. 2.9–10.
32. John 17.21.
33. John 15.1–4.
34. I Cor. 11.23–25.
35. Mark 14.25.
36. I Cor. 10.15.
37. John 6.48–51.

38. I Cor. 4.1; II Cor. 5.18 f.
39. Acts 1.8.
40. I Thess. 1.8.
41. Heb. 12.22.
42. Rev. 19.16.
43. Mark 9.34; 10.35–45.
44. I Cor. 12.28 f.
45. I Cor. 9.1.
46. I Cor. 15.5.
47. Matt. 29.28.
48. Acts 14.14; Rom. 16.7.
49. I Pet. 2.5; Heb. 4.14.
50. Heb. 13.7; I Thess. 5.12; I Cor. 16.15.
51. Phil. 1.1.
52. Acts 14.23; 15.6; 20.17.
53. I Tim. 5.17; I Pet. 5.1; II John 1.
54. Acts 8.14.
55. Acts 15.13; Gal. 2.12.
56. Rom. 15.17.
57. I Cor. 15.5; Matt. 16.18.
58. Gal. 2.11 f.
59. Matt. 18.20.
60. I Cor. 3.11.
61. I Pet. 2.3.
62. I Cor. 3.16; II Cor. 6.16; Eph. 2.21.
63. John 2.19.
64. II Cor. 11.2; Rev. 19.7.
65. Matt. 13.24–30.
66. John 2.19.
67. II Cor. 12.12.27; Rom. 12.5.
68. Col. 1.18; Eph. 4.15.
69. I Cor. 12.26.

INTERCESSION

O GOD, who to an expectant and united Church granted at Pentecost the gift of the Holy Spirit; bless, we beseech thee, the first Assembly of the World Council of Churches, that through the power of the same Spirit those who meet there may attempt great things for thee, and reveal to the world the unity of the One Church of Christ, the very body of thy Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord. *Amen.*

Let us pray for the delegates to the Amsterdam Assembly.

MINISTER: Almighty Father, we pray that no pride of inheritance or of office may prevent the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the delegates at Amsterdam; that before the cross of Christ they may count their riches gain but loss; that they may glory only in the uplifted Christ and in the grace which has called them into his service.

PEOPLE: Grant this, O Lord, we humbly pray.

MINISTER: Grant that the sufferings of the world, its want and fear and confusion, may plead daily in their hearts for courage and devotion; that for the sake of men, women and children who beg for faith and hope, no task shall seem too difficult, no sacrifice too great.

PEOPLE: Grant this, O Lord, we humbly pray.

MINISTER: Grant that they may set the living word of God above all the traditions of men; that no thought of prestige and no concern for the reputation of men or institutions may silence the voice of our broken humanity or the voice of the living God; that Christ himself may live in their hearts and speak in their words.

PEOPLE: Grant this, O Lord, we humbly pray.

MINISTER: Grant that the glory of our unity in Christ may be revealed to them; that the joy of an unbroken and unbreakable fellowship may flood their hearts; that they may be, in truth, ambassadors of the yearnings and hopes of all Christians, the willing servants of a waiting and praying church.

PEOPLE: Grant this, O Lord, we humbly pray, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. *Amen.*

(From a Service of Praise and Intercession issued by The American Committee for The World Council of Churches)

EDUCATING FOR THE MINISTRY

By FREDERICK C. GRANT

PERHAPS the first question to consider is "Why attempt to train ministers at all?" Does not God still call men or "raise them up" (as the Bible puts it) to do his bidding, utter his messages, speak for him to their contemporaries? Are we not in danger of "quenching the Spirit" with our elaborate system of theological education? There are, even today, groups of American Christians who take another view different from ours, in answering these questions. Not only the Fundamentalist sects, either: for even in university circles we meet, from time to time, with the view that theological schools are really technological institutes, whose function is to teach men the tricks of their trade — how to preach, how to run Sunday Schools, how to conduct prayer meetings, how to organize guilds, and that is all. Essentially, the minister must be self-made, or else called and prepared by God!

One of the best answers to this question was given long ago by Pope Gregory in his *Dialogues*. His interlocutor, Peter, remarked that St. Honoratus of Funda, being a great saint, and founder of a monastery, must have had an excellent teacher. Instead, apparently, he had begun preaching, sans books, sans study, even sans ordination. Was this not highly irregular, and should not something be done about it? To which St. Gregory replied:

> I never heard that he was scholar to any: but the grace of the Holy Ghost is not tied to any law. The usual custom of virtuous men is, that none should take upon him to rule, who first hath not learned to obey: nor to command that obedience to his subjects, which before he hath not given to his own superiors. Yet some there be which are so inwardly taught by the doctrine of God's holy spirit that although they have no man to instruct them outwardly, yet do they not want the direction of an inward teacher: which liberty of life notwithstanding is not to be taken for an example by such as be weak and infirm, lest, whiles each one doth in like manner presume to be full of the Holy Ghost, and contemn to learn of any, they become themselves erroneous masters. But that soul which is full of God's holy spirit, hath for proof thereof most evident signs, to wit, the other virtues, and especially humility, both which if they do perfectly meet in one soul apparent it is that they be testimonies of the presence of heavenly grace. (Tr. by P. W., Paris, 1608; ed. by E. G. Gardner, London, 1911, p. 8.)

"But these things," the saint concluded, "are of weaklings to be reverenced, and not by any means to be followed."

The range and thoroughness of theological training to be undertaken depend upon the conception of the ministry held by the church or group responsible for the seminary. The words of the founders of Harvard College (in 1636) have often been quoted: it was their aim that the new colony should not lack a sufficient supply of learned ministers. The words of the founders of Union Theological Seminary (1838) are equally quotable:

> A number of Christians, clergymen and laymen, in the cities of New York and Brooklyn, deeply impressed with the claims of the world upon the church of Christ to furnish a competent supply of well-educated and pious ministers of correct principles, to preach the Gospel to every creature; impressed also with the inadequacy of all existing means for this purpose; and believing that large cities furnish many peculiar facilities and advantages for conducting theological education; after several meetings for consultation and prayer:
>
> *Resolved,* unanimously, in humble dependence on the grace of God, to attempt the establishment of a Theological Seminary in the City of New York.

In considering theological education one thinks of the formula in which the late George Herbert Betts used to sum up religious education in general — it must embrace *knowledge, attitudes,* and *skills.* Our training of men for the ministry ought to be equally comprehensive.

I

Knowledge. 1. The minister should certainly know the Bible, and he should know it not merely as a collection of classic religious literature, closely related to the times and the peoples among whom it was written. It is an ancient book — or library; therefore he must know ancient history, ancient literature, ancient religion and philosophy. If possible, the basis of this knowledge of the past should be acquired in high school and college — quite apart from and antecedent to his study of the Bible in seminary. Every educated man should know something of world-history, the vast and endlessly interesting human past. We cannot at all subscribe to the view of certain teachers set forth at the National Educational Association meeting some years ago, who would "scrap the history books and use the daily newspaper for their text." However, the minister must know the Bible as something more than a collection of religious classics — as in fact the one Book of books which speaks to us, and to all men, with the Voice of God.

2. Certainly the minister should know church history. What would we think of the official representative of any organization, political, commercial, or educational, who did not know the history of his organization? How much more important is it for the minister, who represents an institution — or a movement — which claims that its history through the centuries has been something far more important than an interesting series of episodes, a real tie, in fact, with its supernatural source! Moreover, the enrichment of his own mind, and a certain amount of guidance for the present with its perennial problems inherited from the past, a sense of human solidarity, and an awareness of the dealings of God with our fathers — all this comes from the study of church history. If I had my way, men would study both the Bible and church history for three full years, preferably for four, in every theological seminary!

3. Certainly the minister must also know Christian doctrine, its history, its classic formulations in creeds and articles, in the great systematic books — and also in books which are great without being systematic. Philosophy in general, history of philosophy, logic, metaphysics, and ethics — these ought to be taken in college: perhaps also philosophy of religion, at least in an elementary form. Upon this basis a thorough training in Christian philosophy should be undertaken in seminary. Again, I would urge that systematic theology, philosophy, and ethics should be studied in all three years — preferably in four.

But why a "Christian" philosophy? For the simple reason that a purely "humanistic," objective, scientific, an noncommittal presentation of philosophy is impossible — if it is to remain philosophy. For philosophy also has its own case at court. If its lawyer implies that it has none, he is only being clever — what he wants is to have his case thrown out of court, or to win for his client by default. If philosophy has nothing to prove, no decision to win, no convictions to support, then it has ceased to be philosophy. That is why *our* philosophy must be Christian. In a seminary, certainly, philosophy — or "philosophical theology" as we call it — should be one of the most fundamental and far-reaching of studies. What has modern science to do with religion — or what *will* it do? Is theism still a respectable view? Can a man be intelligent and a Christian? These questions are flung at the minister every day, either in so many words or by implication or innuendo. He had better be ready for them!

Our Roman brethren are wise when they insist upon two years of philosophy to precede the four years of theology. Any *well trained* Roman theologian can easily knock out any *average* Protestant minister in the first round of debate — and the Romans are turning out hundreds of men to do this very thing. If Rome ever gets up to date in its view of history, and of the real content of theology (as distinct for its form, and its antiquated expression), the Roman method will make short work of *average* American Protestantism; which is precisely what Rome intends to do. Our safeguard, as Protestants, is more and better training, *not only* on the philosophical and logical side, but certainly with far more attention to these basic disciplines, and to systematics generally, than is common under the scandalously overdone elective system in vogue today.

4. The clergyman should certainly have a range of knowledge far beyond the Bible and church history and even philosophy and doctrine. The general history of religion — or of religions — is essential, especially in view of the widespread interest of people in the subject, and its enormous relevance for Christian missions. The great classics should be familiar — "books of faith and power" like those recently interpreted with profound sympathy and understanding, and in a most beautiful literary style, by Professor John T. McNeill. The pastor should also know music — both the hymns of the church and also the great classics in musical history generally. He should know Bach and Beethoven as well as the Wesleys and Isaac Watts. There is also a vast area of knowledge — not just of skills — involved in the whole area of religious education and pastoral theology: this also he must master.

5. Every student should have, I believe, a course in the psychology of religion, to open up to him the rich variety in the religious life, to encourage him in cultivating an understanding sympathy with even the most diverse of religious manifestations — not only as reflected in the literature of religion but also in its practice, in its varied types of piety. No man should enter the ministry before he has read William James's classic *Varieties of Religious Experience,* which is still a most valuable book for achieving the result just named. What it implies is as important as the facts it uncovers. This is well brought out in the title of the German translation: *Religiöse Erfahrung in ihrer Mannigaltigkeit,* Religious Experience in its *manifoldness!*

Of the value of present-day psychoanalysis, except in rare cases, I am

not so certain; and I am inclined to agree with those who say that this popular pursuit is really an attempt to overcome the havoc wrought in Protestantism by the wild "evangelism" of a generation ago. It may even represent a continuation, in the scientific field, of the same excessive introspection and subjectivism which the old-fashioned "revivalism" cultivated — and still cultivates, in some places. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that there are broad areas of Christian culture where psychoanalysis is simply uncalled-for, and I think that some of our students who have leaped to the conclusion that "everyone should be psychoanalyzed" are making a very one-sided and partial preparation for the sacred ministry. A constant preoccupation with sin, anxiety, despair, with inner conflicts or tensions, is thoroughly morbid and unhealthy — as one can prove both from classic examples and from current experience. The constant preoccupation of the Christian should be with salvation, release, communion with God and fellowship with man in a life of unselfish, i.e. *un*-self-centered service.

As Emerson once remarked, "Don't tell me that Hogg, with all his grunting virtues, is a better man than some great soul whose spirit mounts daily like an altar flame to God!" And if that is true of Hogg with all his virtues, what shall we say of Hogg's cousin, with all his terrors and torments, his anxiety and doubt and depression, for ever feeling his pulse, even in public, and taking out his thermometer and ostentatiously placing it in his mouth, in order to ascertain his spiritual temperature! It is a pity old Theophrastus is not still with us, to sketch another *Character,* this time the *Christian* fallen into Deisidaimonia! (In fact the caricature can be found in Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress,* strangely enough, and also in the Roman Catholic moralists: his name for the past thousand years has been Mr. Over-Scrupulous, and he is a most destestable bore!)

6. The minister must also know the environments in which people live. He must understand community life and the family. He must be aware of the motives which guide men in their everyday behavior. The conditions of life and of work which surround the ordinary person, and either cramp and confine him or set him free to do his best — these must be perfectly real to the minister if he is going to reach people and serve them effectively. The "ivory tower" or academic kind of minister is pretty much passé these days. I would like to add that a man who is really other-worldly can, at the same time, be perfectly familiar with the conditions under which men, women, and children live in this

world. It is only the man who is familiar with human life as it is actually lived who can find the contact and bring into everyday life the power that comes from that "other" world.

II

Skills. I shall reverse the order of Professor Betts' formula, and deal next with skills.

1. Of course the student must learn how to use his own voice — the most delicate and precious, even though the most commonly used, of all his assorted ministerial tools. Unlike Browning's musician, he cannot "improvise upon the instrument of his own invention" — since he did not invent it; but he can improvise, and practice, and learn its range and capacity, and like a good violinist play upon his instrument until it acquires all the warmth and power of a genuinely human thing. Most men seem never to have heard their own voices, and do not know what they can do with them — a deficiency which Professor Casteel can easily enable them to overcome!

2. Of course the student for the ministry must learn to preach, and to pray in public, and to conduct public services of worship. Some men may be naturally gifted; but even they can be guided to fuller and richer attainments in service to God's church; and at least they can be kept from presuming upon their natural gifts, which sometimes leads to dire downfall, to cranky and eccentric individualism, to downright blasé self-exploitation and self-advertising — for a minister a state approaching that of damnation. On the other hand, men of slight natural gifts can be helped to grow, to open up and receive gifts of grace beyond all natural expectation, to the great joy of their people and the encouragement of God's saints. Preaching can be the most joyful and rewarding kind of work — as a recent novelist has described her hero:

> The following days were so full, however, that he had no time to think of anything except his work. Always, always there was the next sermon to be prepared, and because he was intellectually active, even brilliant, and also because he felt — perhaps through a strain of Scotch Presbyterianism in his blood — that the sermon was the most important part of the service next to the Sacrament, he poured out upon it the best effort of which he was capable. He was surprised now, since he had done little preaching during his Chicago curateship, to discover that instead of having to search for a subject, it was a matter of selection. Dozens of ideas, of themes, of texts, jostled each other in his mind, eager for consideration. He was glad of this. He liked this warm rich feeling of mental fertility. But once the idea was chosen, there was hard, gruelling work to be done.

For the weight of a perfectionistic compulsion lay upon him. The most difficult thing was to compress all he wanted to say into twenty minutes. It would be infinitely easier to speak for an hour. The narrow space of time meant ruthless pruning of sentences, continual readjustment of material, painstaking care in highlighting and emphasis. (*From The Bishop's Mantle.* Copyright, 1947, by Agnes Sligh Turnbull. Used by permission of the Macmillan Company, publishers.)

3. The clergyman must also know how to go about the task of religious education — to my mind it is as important as preaching. And since I have the floor, I shall make a plea for education in morals, in Christian ethics, in addition to instruction in the Christian faith, church history, and the art of worship. Perhaps other churches than my own do not need the admonition — though I suspect that they do. The old-fashioned confirmation class ran for several months, and included a thorough course in Christian morals (based on the Catechism): today, it usually lasts only three or four weeks, and includes a sketch of church history, a few words about the sacraments, and sundry explanations of vestments, prayer-book, and church furnishings. The theory is that the rest will follow, after the candidate is confirmed; that the whole life of the communicant is one long extension course in religious education. But the theory is only an excuse. We meet with plenty of people who have not the faintest notion that Christian ethics differs in any way from ordinary "good citizenship," good "Americanism," or "good neighborliness." This is a great error. The Christian life is, in its very essence, a new and different *kind* of life. There are marks that should distinguish the Christian from even the best of followers of "the religion of all good men."

4. Pastoral work is the parson's business — and he cannot think himself equipped for it unless he has had not only theoretical instruction but also practical experience. This too, like all the other work of a minister, *can* be a constant joy, and not a burden; though it cannot *be* a joy unless it is also something of a burden, a hard task which a man takes in utter seriousness, and to which he gives his very best, without stint, without reserve, without sparing himself.

5. All these are skills, and there are others as well. If possible, a man would do well to have some skill in music. I know a seminary (of the Swedish Mission Church, in Chicago) where every student is required to play the organ and sing — for he will often be required to "lead the music" in the little churches out on the prairies. Moreover, a man

should have some skills of a purely recreative kind: I do not say the Seminary should train him in these, but at least it should encourage their acquirement. He needs as rich a life as possible, if he is to be "all things to all men," if he is even to keep sweet and sane and wholesome in temper, sunny in disposition and demeanor, even at times when circumstances may incline him otherwise.

6. Finally, there are certain skills — perhaps we may call them that — which can be acquired, and without which men often handicap themselves very seriously. I mean such things as personal appearance; neatness and tidiness of rooms, books, notes, term-papers, neckties; even properly brushed hair and spotless apparel, clean hands and finger-nails, and all the rest of good etiquette as well. It may not seem important, but the senior warden's wife will surely notice if the new curate seems not to know he should take the outside of the sidewalk; that he should answer invitations — and other letters! — and that he should return invitations, and not sponge. The warden himself will probably notice it if the clergyman always hesitates, and lets the layman pay the bus-fare! A man should know what he needs in the way of salary, ask for it, and then pay his own way, and be as prompt in passing as in accepting favors! But these things are close to the area of Christian good breeding. I often think of the words of Coventry Patmore: "There is nothing comparable for moral force to the charm of truly noble manners."

III

Attitudes. 1. Every man should view his ministry as a privilege, not as a right. He is the Lord's steward, yes; but as our Anglican Prayer Book puts it, he must never "lord it over God's heritage." Or, as St. Gregory put it long ago, *humility* is the true mark of the "servus servorum Dei." This attitude is absolutely fundamental.

2. The ideal of Christianity is the saint, not the theologian — granted! But the ordinary man needs all the theology he can acquire: his own, built upon some other, no doubt, but still his own, so that he can speak with conviction and not merely by quotation of authorities. Hence the attitude of open-mindedness is essential. Most of our students already have this — it is characteristic of most theological students today; occasionally we must help a man to acquire it.

3. He should view faith as a *growth,* not an acquisition. In fact he

should get started on a career of spiritual growth — or continue one already begun — which is to be his for the rest of his life. Only so can he hope to help others to grow spiritually. To shut himself off from others, especially in the fellowship of public worship, is a terrible mistake.

4. He should be helped to realize that religion is something objectively real — not just my private relation to God, but my relation as part of a far greater system of relations, as old as history and as wide as the human race. He may not center his theology in the church — though he had better be aware of the values in such a theology; but at least he must recognize the validity of other men's experience as well as his own, and of the great world-wide human experience of God through the ages. In a word, our minister should be catholic-minded, or ecumenical, in some degree or other, either fully or in part, if he is to serve the church today and tomorrow.

5. He must be above such bad traits as one often finds underscored in caricatures of the ministry: self-seeking, self-advertising, gossip, and the bearing of false witness against his neighbors — especially his own brethren! Seminary is a good place to get over such habits, if a man has them; and to acquire their opposites, under the aegis of that noble spirit of fellowship and of seeking "each the other's good" which really does, thank God, inspire many seminaries.

6. He may be a liberal, or a conservative — it does not greatly matter. (An Anglican is both, and so he can say this!) For true liberalism is not really opposed to conservatism, but to fanaticism and bigotry — the spirit which insists that if I am right, you must be wrong at every point on which we disagree. Nor is true conservatism opposed to true liberalism, but to a shallow, spendthrift, lax regard for the treasures and values of the past, one which would dissipate them or abandon them without a moment's hesitation. Conservatism means loyalty, means appreciation of real values, and the desire to conserve them. Let us hope our students will be both liberals *and* conservatives, in the true sense!

7. Finally, an attitude we should encourage in everyone is a willingness to stand the gaff, an ability to take hard knocks with a smile, to keep on steadily, whatever the discouragements, without complaining. As Lowell said long ago, "A gentleman consumes his own smoke." And yet what a lot of complaining one hears among certain groups of ministers — some of it justified, no doubt; and yet even so it ought to be suppressed!

I often receive letters from young clergymen — and some who are older — who have been in a parish two years, or three, and "have done their work" and are "ready for something new." Poor men — as if a man could really finish his work, anywhere, in short of forty years! As I often have to tell them, "If you do not stick it out and solve the problems of your parish, someone else will have to do so — and why not you?"

Among the letters of Pope Leo the Great there is one (variously numbered 8, 14, or 12, written after January 6, i.e. Epiphany, in the year 446) to his friend Anastasius, bishop of Thessalonica. Chapter IX of that letter deals with a curious problem: *De clericis transfugis* — "of runaway clergymen." They are not to be fed, housed, or shown any manner of hospitality (unless in grave danger of death), but are to be compelled to go back to their own bishops and to get on with their jobs where they belong. Neither desire nor ambition is any excuse! — Evidently the problem is not new: and we ought, I think, to do what we can in the Seminary to encourage men to "stick it out," when sticking is required; to "endure hardness, as a good soldier of Jesus Christ," when tough endurance is what is needed. (But I also think we should urge bishops, superintendents, and others to see that when a man *has* stuck it out for a reasonable time he should have relief, promotion if possible, or at least a change. It is not often, in the Christian warfare, that a man needs literally to die at his post: another man may win a victory there!)

IV

Perhaps we can see the need for correction or amplification of our theological education the better if we examine some of the defects now current — the result, very largely, of inadequate high-school and college education.

1. Too many students cannot spell accurately, punctuate, or use proper grammar. The same goes for vast numbers of the ordained ministers of our churches.

2. The attitude of too many of them toward the study of foreign languages, especially the ancient ones, is little less than a phobia — encouraged, alas, by poor teaching of languages in many schools, and by pastors who excuse their own ignorance or handicap by telling the candidates that "languages are a waste of time."

3. Too few have been trained in even elementary logic — they feel contradictions, or they draw inferences by intuition.

4. They are far more thoroughly schooled in criticism than in exposition. They can attack and tear down better than they can build up.

5. World-literature, world-history, and the general history of philosophy are almost unknown to the majority. Some of the simplest allusions to general history or literature are completely over their heads.

6. There is an appalling ignorance of classical poetry and art — the great tradition of religion in our race ought to carry with it its own expression in art and poetry; but, alas, this is not so. Poetry is even looked upon with scorn by many! This is a high price to pay for the "college activities" and campus fame which some of them achieved before entering seminary.

7. The single-track mind that knows only the Bible and theology — or only the Bible — is headed for fundamentalism; and there are students, even in liberal seminaries, who face that way.

We have some of the best students in the world in the seminaries these days — but they deserve a far better preparation than we can ever give them, for lack of the foundation which their high-school and college courses should have provided. I sometimes wonder how certain American colleges justify their tuition charges; they simply do not give education in return for the fee. And I do not refer to education of colored students (though many of them are most grievously sinned against) — I mean certain colleges for white students, whose standards are far too low, and where typical American "activism" has apparently driven out all study, thought, speculation, independent research, creative thinking, poetry, art, and philosophy. Believe it or not, we seem to have teachers of literature, here in America, who can barely read and write, and of philosophy who *have* no philosophy and who do nothing more than rehash the standard textbooks.

In brief, the preparation given at the average American college for the study of theology is very inadequate — due partly to the elective system (which I believe should have much less place in college curricula than it is now given), and partly to inadequate and mechanical teaching (which the present over-crowding greatly aggravates). Too few theological students have had any proper grounding in philosophy, either in its history or in logical, philosophical thinking. Too few are really familiar with the great classics of literature. Too few have a firm

grasp of the outlines of universal human history — and almost none have any acquaintance with historical method. The history they know is from little green or red books which pretend to cover the field in full outline, but with rarely a suggestion that for many important areas the sources are either totally lacking or scanty, while in others they are third-hand, contradictory, or conjectural. The little red and green textbooks glide over these spots with swift and sweeping generalizations — or worse, with entirely dogmatic statements, repeated from earlier textbooks — moving fast, like skaters on thin ice, for whom speed and assurance are their only safety. But when the student comes face to face with biblical history, and with certain areas of ecclesiastical history, where only tradition is available and not first-hand written sources, his difficulties are almost insuperable, and he feels himself driven to either skepticism or fundamentalism: either the chronology of the Exodus — or of the New Testament — is plain on the face of the literature, and difficult statements must be suppressed, or else we cannot know anything at all about it. He has never heard of such a thing as historical probability, and the necessity for alternative conjectures. Either Jesus said everything attributed to him in the Gospels, including the Gospel of John — preaching at different times and on different occasions (the Johannine sayings forming a body of esoteric teaching not divulged to the public, which is a hypothesis in flagrant contradiction to the whole scheme of the fourth Gospel) — or else we cannot rely on anything in the Gospels. He has never heard, apparently, of the problems of historiography, or of the method indispensable in the reconstruction of the sayings or the teaching of ancient philosophers, prophets, and religious teachers who did not happen to write down their words for posterity: e.g. Socrates, Pythagoras, Posidonius, the Buddha, Numenius, or (close to the New Testament) — the great rabbis of the Tannaite period. Paul's theology can be reconstructed from his surviving letters — but the teaching of Jesus is embodied in a tradition, multiform and divergent. No wonder if the student sees only two alternatives before him, the two already mentioned, skepticism and fundamentalism — or, possibly, two others, Liberalism and Catholicism; though the last two are rarely embraced by Protestants at the present time.

So much for the preparation — now what shall the minister preach? One summer, forty years ago, I was holding services at a railway junc-

tion and a lumber camp in northern Wisconsin. One Sunday the bishop arrived for his annual visitation — it was the Anglo-Catholic Bishop Charles Chapman Grafton, S.S.J.E. His sermon was, one might say, "out of this world." It was all about the diverse offices of the Cherubim and the Seraphim; for the bishop was then writing his famous *Catholic Atlas,* which is an outline of Anglo-Catholic dogmatics. The Cherubim symbolized, indeed expressed, even embodied the powers of God (as in Nature), and their highest spiritual activity was the *knowledge* of God; the Seraphim were a still higher angelic order and burned with *love* for God, in eternal adoration — a higher order, as Mary's part was better than Martha's, and should "not be taken from her." What a sermon, you may say, for a congregation of railway and roundhouse men and their families and the villagers of that remote division point on the Soo and Wisconsin Central railways! Yet as we came out of church that morning, we looked with new eyes upon the endless green, sweet-smelling forest about us, and upon the vast dome of the blue northern sky with its drifting mountains of snow-white cumulus clouds, while the warm sunshine flooded our sooty town and ripened the wild blackberries in their open patches on the edge of the woods. This was *God's* world, sustained by his mysterious power, and itself aflame with the Seraph's unceasing love for the Creator — even as Dante had seen the world six hundred years before us, or as the prophets and poets of the Old Testament, nearly three thousand years ago God "rode upon the Cherubim," and "his angels were flames of fire!" That is religion, as old as the prophets and psalmists of the former dispensation, as old as Ras Shamra, and living still at the heart of the Christian faith. I wish that our students today could learn to preach a *little* more of that *kind* of religion, and a little less about current problems (at least as a steady diet). They would, for one thing, I am certain, not get so completely discouraged. And for another, they would be nourishing — and be nourished by — the living heart of the Church which lives by its faith in, its love for, its obedience to the Eternal and Transcendent One.

SOCIAL AND POLITICAL FACTORS IN ECUMENICAL WORK

By ALEXANDER MILLER

IN the Winter 1948 issue of CHRISTENDOM Professor John C. Bennett has an illuminating article on the peculiar position of American Christians in the ecumenical movement, especially in the discussions which will reach their climax at Amsterdam. He points out — for the sake of Americans themselves in the first place — what an effort of understanding is required between, for example, American and European Christians. Americans are puzzled by what they tend to regard as the unfounded suspicions of Europeans. They are vaguely hurt to find that well-intentioned American attempts at ecumenical co-operation and at physical relief are construed as "imperialistic" by those, even Christians, to whom they are directed. Dr. Bennett pleads that American Christians should make a real effort to see themselves as others see them: they should allow for an understandable dubiety on the part of European Christians about the seriousness of much American Christianity; they should be prepared to accept the fact that the invidious American situation in respect of race relations must cut away the effectiveness of much of their influence; they should allow for the complexes which are set up abroad by the dependence of impoverished nations upon American benevolence, both offical (Marshall Plan) and unofficial; and they should also be prepared for suspicion as to whether America's efforts in matters of that sort *are* wholly benevolent.

All this is important, and so also is the warning which Dr. Bennett adds against the opposite danger of a spurious American humility, the false attitude which would yield too easily to outside criticism, and which would discount real American achievements and the contribution which America can bring to ecumenical churchmanship and to international health.

I have recapitulated what seems to me the main trend of Dr. Bennett's article, because it offers a lead into a discussion of an even more fundamental question, of a similar kind — a question which arises where ecumenical discussion has to take account of social forces which

originate outside the ecumenical Church but are profoundly influential within it.

I

We have heard the complaint of Eastern Christians about the domination of the West in ecumenical councils, and have tried to reckon with it. There is clearly an *a priori* likelihood that such a lack of balance will exist, in view of the Western origins and Genevan headquarters of the ecumenical movement. Its leaders are well enough aware of that, and doubtless watch out for it. On the other hand, the younger Churches of the East are liable to lack balance in their impatience with the leadership of the West, and to refuse even that wholesome deference which is due to the old in any sphere of life. Obviously the younger Churches can bring a vital corrective to that hardening of the arteries which tends to affect the older Christian communities; but there is also something quite indispensable to the universal Church in the venerable tradition of "Western Christendom." For the moment I am not concerned to discover exactly how far the disparity of influence is real, but rather, in so far as it is real, to enumerate the more obvious reasons for it, and to call attention to one which is less obvious but crucially important.

In the first place, the redemption wrought in Christ has not delivered branches of the Catholic Church from human and sinful parochialism, and no doubt both East and West are susceptible to it. Let the West at any rate simply accept the indictment, repent and try to amend.

In the second place, there is a habit of dominance in the West which is an inheritance from the age of colonial expansion of the "great powers," and which without a doubt has seeped more deeply than we like to admit into the consciousness of Western Christians, especially the Anglo-Saxons. It is this that sets Asia on guard, makes the Christians of Asia suspicious about any pretension to leadership even in theology if it emanates from the West, and makes them sensitive, perhaps even over-sensitive, about the predominance of European and American influence in ecumenical councils.

In the third place, Asia still feels the impact of American (which is to say Western) pressure along its eastern coast. As Professor Bennett puts it in the CHRISTENDOM article referred to:

> Both Europe and Asia are caught between America and Russia quite obviously, and what Americans seldom realise is that it is difficult for people so situ-

ated to know whether to fear or resent more the power of Russia or the power of America.

I am writing at the end of two years in New Zealand, which is a sort of Anglo-Saxon outpost on the frontier of Asia, and not a bad point of vantage. I should put the matter even more positively, as I think it was put at Oslo and will be put at Amsterdam: that rightly or wrongly the pressure of American influence along the Pacific Coast of Asia feels like reaction and imperialism to the alert Asian, while the appeal of Russia is the appeal of at least the reality of socialism and a tolerable economy, with the end of colonial exploitation and a racial equality of which colonial Asia has had little enough experience so far.

All that adds up to a situation fraught with danger to real ecumenical discussion, unless the Western Churches can make an effort of understanding analogous to that which Dr. Bennett asks of the Americans in respect of Europe.

II

But there is more to be said. I do not believe that the ecumenical neglect of the East which the Christians of Asia feel so keenly springs only from human and sinful parochialism or from a carry-over into the Church of the imperialistic habit of mind. The blind eye which we tend to turn to potent movements in Asia is due to the class character of the Western Church, and not simply to the fact that it *is* Western. The fact is that the social groups with which the Western (non-Roman) Church is most closely allied are socially conditioned to discount the Asiatic ferment, and are in particular disinclined to give proper weight to the importance of the peoples' movements say in India, in North China and in Indonesia. The groups in the West which have a vested interest in the social and economic status quo are conditioned against paying proper attention to the revolutionary ferment in the East, because it holds the promise of basic transformations in the world society: and it is those groups which by and large shape the thinking of Western Christendom. On the other hand, those proletarian groups in the West whose interests lie in radical social change eagerly mark every move among the peoples of the East simply *because* they hold the promise of revolutionary transformation: but it is precisely those proletarian groups which are not represented in ecumenical councils.

So the thinking of Western Christendom (and of the ecumenical movement which is so strongly shaped by it) is doubly conditioned

against paying proper attention to Eastern movement; first by its natural parochialism reinforced by the habit of dominance, and second by the fact that its class character makes it blind to the potency of proletarian and peoples' movements, which are the characteristic movements of contemporary Asia.

This point cannot be made too strongly, and it is probably best made by an Anglo-Saxon. I understand that in certain areas of South India, for example, there is such an overlap between the membership of the Church and the membership of the Communist Party that there is mutual accommodation about the times of meeting on Sundays. This in itself means of course that the Communist Party of India is not the Communist Party of the USA or Europe, and there are numerous other implications to be drawn from the situation. The important point for our purpose is, however, that just *because* this is a situation which does not exist in the West it is doubly important that we Western Christians should remember that it does exist in India: otherwise we shall waltz gaily into the ecumenical discussion group and because such outlandish possibilities do not even enter our minds we shall not only be unintentionally rude to our brethren from the East but we shall write a report which is wildly out of focus because it simply discounts the possibility of Communist-Christian relationships of that kind. That is an example of the kind of blind spot which is the inevitable result of our Western origins and our bourgeois affiliations, and which can vitiate much ecumenical discussion if it is not allowed for.

III

I do not think that we can take the discussion to this point without carrying it one vital stage further. I want now to take a square look at the ecumenical movement with the fact of this bourgeois conditioning in mind.

Let us recognise in the first place that the ecumenical movement is a representative affair, the reflection of the life of the churches *as they are*. No doubt it does gather to itself elements of leadership which are ahead of the general body of church opinion, but by and large it must accept the limitations which derive from its official and representative character. Its leadership will include both prophets and pedants, for so do the constituent churches. Its work in the nature of the situation must largely be consolidation and unification: there is a limit to what it can do in the way of pioneering, say in social insight and in social

experiment. In particular it will be bedevilled constantly in our day by the class character of the churches in these countries which are numerically strongest and correspondingly influential in ecumenical affairs. We have seen how this may bring about a lack of balance as between the West, which is conservative in social matters, and the East, which is radical.

It is clear that within the ecumenical movement itself the weight of this criticism is being felt. M. M. Thomas of India, and other Christians whose thinking is self-consciously Asian, have drawn attention to the bourgeois limits within which ecumenical thinking tends to move. It is clear also that in those countries (Germany for example) which lie between Russia and Anglo-Saxon Christendom, the reborn Church is not in the least content to have its relations to the working class or to socialism shut up within the limits which have become habitual among the middle-class Christians of America and Britain. For example the Christian journal *Unterwegs* (Berlin: No. 5, 1947) prints a set of Theses concerning the Relation of Socialism and Christianity which are for presentation at Amsterdam and which represent an emphasis which is new in ecumenical discussion of such matters. And it is new because it springs out of a situation strange to us Anglo-Saxons, but full of significance for the future relations of the world-church with the world's people.

Here we come to the crux of the matter. The complaint of the East and the revolt in middle-Europe against the limitations of ordinary ecumenical discussion of social matters has the most radical implications. For what is actually happening the world over? It is a movement analogous to that out of which came Augustine's *Civitas Dei*. The old citadels are threatened by a new "barbarian invasion," in the form of an insurgent movement of the world proletariat. To Indian and Chinese Christians that is a commonplace and the Church in Germany is apparently learning it fast. The danger is that the Western Church and the ecumenical movement will either learn it too late, or react to it in the wrong way.

For what are the pitfalls which beset the Church in the face of a situation of this kind? In the first place there is the temptation to label the contemporary "Alaric's men" as the enemies of God because they are for the most part either unbelieving or heretical. But they are not the enemies of God: they are the children of God who have long been shut out from full participation in the world society and are now furi-

ously demanding their inheritance. The world proletariat may often move in anger, under bad leadership, by the way of violence, to cruel and tyrannical ends of plunder and excess. But they are not the enemies of God, though they may threaten many an ancient citadel of peace and power. They are the children of the most high God who have been refused by his Church a clear testimony to his being and to his love, and shut out from his bounty.

The second temptation of the Church is to identify the threatened City of Rome with the heavenly Jerusalem, and to believe that the true defence of the Church is to barricade the walls of Rome. That is a peculiar temptation to a Church — an ecumenical Church — which has been too long and too closely dependent on the old Rome of capitalist privilege and imperialist power.

Fifth-century Rome did not survive and in the nature of the case could not survive. Nor will our Western society come through the present social crisis without radical transformation. To resist that transformation is to make its painful doom more sure. The leadership of the ecumenical movement is safe only in the hand of men who know this, and in whose minds there is no confusion between Western civilisation — that compound of "Christian liberalism" and capitalist exploitation — and the Church of the living God. As for the "barbarians," the proletarian people, those foreigners in our society and those strangers to our church councils: the authentic Christian response to the threat which they offer the old citadels is to *move over among them* in a contemporary movement analogous to that of mediaeval monasticism, in a new movement of evangelism-in-identification which is the only mission movement that matters for the future.

This sets new tasks in theology, particularly in social theology, and may involve a reformation of church life in all its range. In particular it will require a new discipline of identification with the working people, for God's word of reconciliation cannot be spoken to them without hypocrisy by a Church whose members retain economic privilege and whose congregations embody economic inequality.

It may be that in the witness of men like M. M. Thomas out of India and of the Christians who minister to the workers of Germany among the ruins of Berlin there is growing an ecumenical movement for the service of the ecumenical movement. Heaven forbid that such a group should be organised over against the World Council of Churches! In-

formally active *within* the World Council it might do vital service in these specific ways:

(1) In insisting day in and day out that the ecumenical movement can live and act effectively only if it recognises and transcends the conditioning effect of its Western and bourgeois origins.

(2) In bringing into the store of ecumenical undesrtanding the experience of Christian groups in the East, in Europe, and elsewhere which are in living relation to the world proletariat.

(3) In working at the theological and practical tasks which are presented by the new mission enterprise, the penetration of the Church into the midst of the world proletariat.

Nothing less than such a movement of identification will bring the heavenly Jerusalem before the eyes of those who sit among the ruins of earthly cities: such a movement of identification might even by the grace of God prevent the piling of ruin on ruin.

THE FUTURE OF THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE FOR THE WORLD COUNCIL

By HENRY SMITH LEIPER

NO one can say at this writing exactly what the future of the American Committee is to be. Only the Assembly or its Central Committee is competent to suggest the most desirable form of organization.

There are, however, certain probabilities which may be indicated here. To understand them a word of background may be helpful. The American Committee is the result of an evolution which began in 1937 following the World Conferences at Oxford and Edinburgh. Previous to 1937, there had been two bodies in America respectively related to what were commonly known as "Stockholm" and "Lausanne." The former grew out of the 1925 World Conference on Life and Work: the latter out of the 1927 World Conference on Faith and Order. The latter was strictly a delegated body created by appointment of representatives from member denominations. The former was partly a delegated body and partly a co-opted one.

It was believed that the first World Assembly could be held in 1941, and in order to prepare for it these two American sections of the bodies most closely related to the formation of the World Council were merged into a body known as the "Joint Executive Committee."

With the coming of World War II and the certainty that the provisional period in the formation of the World Council would be of long duration, it was thought desirable by the member churches to form a strictly delegated body with no co-opted members. This could only be done when there were "member" churches. In 1937 no provisional form of organization yet existed; consequently no Churches had been invited to join the World Council. However, following the Constitutional meeting in Utrecht in 1938, invitations went to Churches to become members in the 1937 World Conferences. The Churches then began to act and the number of member Churches from America steadily grew until they reached a total twenty-eight, with prospect of more before the Assembly meets. These Churches in America are now the constituting body of the American Committee. But it is still a

committee *for* and not *of* the World Council; since no international action was involved in its establishment it would not have been correct to suggest that it was technically or constitutionally a part of the World Council.

Recommendations made by the Provisional Committee when it met in America in 1947, and of the Administrative Committee meeting in Switzerland in 1948, will probably lead the Assembly in Amsterdam to direct that the American office — which has always been an office of both the national and the world-wide body — become in the fullest sense an office of the latter. It is to be assumed that the delegates of the Churches to the Amsterdam Assembly or their successors — possibly in combination with their alternates — will constitute the most responsible body in America of the World Council. Furthermore the thirteen American members of the Central Committee — which succeeds the present Provisional Committee as the continuously functioning body of the Council — will probably be constituted as a kind of steering or administrative committee within the larger American group; although not acting independently of the world organization in any matters save those concerning solely the member churches in America.

It is anticipated that the American Committee at its meeting in June will vote to dissolve when its successor body has been created; and that all of its elected officers will present their resignations to take effect if the successor body desires to make changes when it constitutes itself. It is to be expected, however, that the new chief officers will be elected not in America but at Amsterdam by the Central Committee. This would be in keeping with the plan of having the New York office become in fact the "inter-American" office of the world organization.

The recommendations also contemplate the approach to American member Churches for support through the world organization rather than through any national group or budget.

Recognizing the fact that the World Council is a fellowship of denominations and that local churches or individuals therefore cannot join it directly, the American Committee incorporated some years ago the Friends of the World Council of Churches, Inc. This body, which is fully competent legally to receive and hold funds, is of course a purely American organization. It has already been the medium through which Mr. Rockefeller gave the first million for the World Council. And it has lately been the recipient of a $25,000 gift in memory of Bishop Brent, the interest of which is for the Faith and Order

Commission of the World Council. It is, consequently, properly regarded as a continuing asset for the total work; and it has the added advantage of being a body which can welcome local churches of denominations not yet members of the World Council, as well as associations and individuals concerned for the welfare and advancement of the work.

The suggestion has been made that appeals in America to individuals, foundations, and associations, as well as to local Councils and local Churches might wisely be made in the future through the Friends of the World Council. In the past, all appeals of every kind have been made through the American Committee; but givers and local churches contributing have been enrolled as members of the "Friends."

There may be changes in this pattern. But since it seems to meet with the general approval of the bodies most directly concerned as expressed through their delegated representatives, and since the Amsterdam Assembly will hardly wish to go against the soberly expressed judgment of its member Churches in this country with respect to how they may best conduct their work in support of the Council in this area, the general outlines of the plan are likely to stand pretty much as indicated.

In conclusion it ought to be added that after Amsterdam the World Council as a world-wide body will have three fully official centers of activity: Geneva, London and New York. Following the conference to be held by the East Asia Churches in China this coming October it is expected that a fourth will be added — an East Asia office which will jointly represent the World Council and the International Missionary Council. For the purpose of outlining the nature and work of this projected office — first requested by the National Christian Council of China — a special conference was held this past January in Manila. Dr. William J. Decker and Bishop Stephen Neill, representing respectively the I. M. C. and the W. C. C., were in attendance as well as chosen delegates from the Younger Churches of Asia. It is noteworthy that the Churches of Australia and New Zealand have indicated their desire to be included in the plan for the East Asia office, which may in time become one of the busiest and most important centers of ecumenical activity.

CONTEMPORARY BOOKS

THE EUROPEAN VIEWPOINT IN THEOLOGY

THE KINGSHIP OF CHRIST: AN INTERPRETATION OF RECENT EUROPEAN THEOLOGY, *by* W. A. VISSER 'T HOOFT. *Harper & Brothers, $1.75.*

AMERICAN delegates to the Assembly of World Council of Churches in Amsterdam this summer will receive a shock when they encounter the theological and social outlook of their European colleagues. Dr. 't Hooft does much in this volume to cushion that shock. He makes the European viewpoint intelligible. Wise delegates will therefore make this book required reading.

The author uses the device of expounding the classic idea of the threefold character of Christ: as prophet, priest and king. He argues that these three are inseparable and that Christian thinking goes astray when any one of these is emphasized to neglect of the other two. Pietism and mysticism stressed the priesthood of Christ, making the sacrifice for sin his important work. Liberalism emphasized his prophetic ministry as the great teacher. Concentration on his kingship alone led to utopianism and apocalypticism. Dr. 't Hooft pleads for a complete view in which all three are held together, and each is seen in its relation to the others.

In a rapid survey of European theology he shows the reactions of Christian leaders to the devastating effects of the First World War, the Nazi domination before and during the Second World War, and the chaotic postwar conditions. By a return from cultural influences to the Bible "read in the light of its own presuppositions" the churches consolidated their own position in the face of persecution and apostasy, and from that position launched their counterattacks on the enemy. At the same time they were made humble in the recognition of their own defection.

The results of recent biblical criticism are then reviewed with special reference to the interpretation of the lordship of Christ. Here it is shown that the term "Lord" is to be understood in the context of Jewish rather than Hellenistic thought, so that Christ is offered as the lord of history, embodying as well as preaching the Kingdom of God. Here the author argues, with Professor Cullman, that while the Kingdom of God is to come in the future, the Kingdom of Christ is already achieved. The apparent contradiction between passages expounding a futurist eschatology and those teaching a realized eschatology is bridged by the theory that while "the powers of this world" have been dethroned they have not admitted defeat and must therefore still be crushed. In this state we live pending the return of Christ, and here is the tension between faith in the ultimate

victory and recognition of "the present evil world" which is resolved in the apocalyptic vision of *Revelation.*

Christ the King creates his own new community: the Church. This community "represents, however, more a promise than a reality." Those who live "in Christ" live in this promise, but also in the actual new situation created by the death and resurrection of Christ, and they embody Christ in the present world even while they are awaiting his kingship over the world. The Church is thus both the historical aspect of the Kingdom and subject to the final judgment of that Kingdom. Consequently our pulpits must proclaim both the victory in Christ and the need of repentance, and our churches must maintain their cohesion in the face of secularization and their unity in the face of internal dissension.

Thus the Church knows Christ in a way that the world does not, and shares in his victory; so that its task in the world is to speak its message of judgment and of confidence, to pray for the world in its need, but always to point the world to Christ. It will also protest against the claims of any political state to be autonomous or absolute, because from the eschatological standpoint all history, including the historical church, is called in question.

This whole approach to the task of the churches today reflects the recent return to the doctrine of the Second Coming among continental European theologians; but this exposition is accompanied in Dr. 't Hooft's volume by an attack on other forms of the social gospel, and the polemic concern leads him into unfortunate misrepresentation of those other forms.

He is opposed to natural theology and to the liberal social gospel, which he treats quite superficially as a simple moralizing on sociological questions. His attack on Archbishop Temple's natural theology is unconvincing because the author himself provides no means of passing from biblical teaching to the will of God for men today. If we are to use the Bible in the non-biblical society, we are forced to find some common denominator in history, and this is precisely what natural theology seeks, — and what Dr. 't Hooft himself acknowledges when he says, "We need all the help of our faculties of imagination, reason and observation in order to understand the structure, the inner cohesion and purposefulness of God's design for ourselves and for the world" (p. 144). When he quotes Karl Barth on the use of analogy (p. 146) he introduces the methodological principle of natural theology in another way.

Part of his difficulty arises from failure to explore adequately the intermediate realm between the church and the world in the life and attitudes of Christian church members. He misses Schleiermacher's whole point here be citing (p. 25) simply the *Glaubenslehre* and ignoring the *Sittenlehre* where so much attention is given to the relation between church and state via the community. Even in the *Glaubenslehre* (§105, Eng. tr., p. 471)

Schleiermacher dealt with the relation of church to state through conscience and "temper of mind."

It may be fairly asked whether this new development in the eschatological emphasis is not in danger of abstracting attention from concrete sociological judgments which have to be made as part of Christian ethics, and thus of making the church a proclaimer of high sounding generalizations of a theological sort about the kingship of Christ and the Last Judgment without providing the rational bases for considered action in social crises.

But, since this new emphasis is so strong on the Continent, Americans going to Amsterdam had better be aware of it before they engage in the discussions of the Assembly, or there will be untold confusion and perhaps serious antagonism. The General Secretary of the World Council of Churches has done us a real service in making the new eschatological view of the Church so clear and challenging.

EDWIN E. AUBREY

THE PERSON AS PART AND AS WHOLE

THE PERSON AND THE COMMON GOOD, *by* JACQUES MARITAIN. *Charles Scribner's Sons, $2.00.*

MARITAIN returns in this book to a subject that he has often stressed but about which he always writes with freshness and power. His main point is the most important thing that can ever be said about the relation between the person and the community. It is the idea that the person at the same time lives for the community and transcends the community, that necessary as the political order is and important as the person's political obligations are, the meaning and vocation of the person are not limited to his political responsibilities. This can never be said too often in these days and we may be thankful that Jacques Maritain says it so persuasively.

If in some writers this kind of doctrine is used to smear the whole modern effort to secure greater social justice by means of greater collectivism, this is not the case with Maritain. He is one man who really fights both against reaction and against Communist forms of oppression; and in doing so he occupies the most difficult and yet, in the end, for the Christian the only tenable position.

The first part of the book grounds the discussion in Thomist thought and does so with great clarity. The most important philosophical tool that is used is the distinction between the *individual* and the *person*. This is familiar ground for readers of Maritain. Individuality denotes the material basis of personal life and it also denotes separateness. The individual is merely a part of a larger whole. The person is spiritual, made for relations with other persons and especially with God, a whole — but, as Maritain says suggestively, an "open" whole. The whole argument is put in the context of the idea that the person's dignity consists ultimately in its capacity for the

vision of God. It would be possible to come to the same conclusion by stressing the idea that the person is an object of the divine love. This would be a more credible way of putting the matter in the context of Protestant theology. In both contexts we may affirm the faith that the person transcends the political order.

There is one sentence that Maritain quotes from his earlier book, *The Rights of Man and Natural Law,* which states perfectly the argument of this book: "Man finds himself by subordinating himself to the group, and the group attains its goal only by serving man and by realizing that man has secrets which escape the group and a vocation which the group does not encompass." He says over and over again that there is no common good that does not flow back into the welfare of the persons who are both "wholes" and members of the social whole. This is the basis of his Christian "personalism" which is in his mind as far removed from bourgeois individualism as it is from Communist collectivism.

JOHN C. BENNETT

RADICAL PERSONALISM IN A MIDDLE-OF-THE-ROAD VERSION

GOD AND MEN, *by* HERBERT H. FARMER. *Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, $2.00.*

THIS book contains the Lyman Beecher Lectures at the Divinity School of Yale University in April, 1946. The discussion is a semi-popular handling of the Christian faith in a systematic and facile exposition. Its distinctive characteristic is what the author calls the "radical personalism" in the Christian faith. Personality is the ultimate philosophical and theological category, the explanatory conception and final reality of religion. Dr. Farmer devotes considerable space to the vindication of the "world of persons" as deserving primary consideration. He shows the complete failure of impersonalism along several lines of theoretical and practical enquiry. Thus he repudiates the perspective of Bertrand Russell and adopts that of Pringle-Pattison.

Dr. Farmer emphasizes what we may call the ubiquity and primacy of the personal claim, a claim that is continuous though embracing the divine and human dimensions. Man "is related at the same time and all the time to the claim of the infinite Person and to the claims of other finite persons" (p. 62). The relationship is dual, but it is not two relationships. The claim of God and the claim of the neighbour are distinguishable in thought but in actuality they are "wholly inseparable from one another." In other words: "God's claim on me meets me always in and through the claim of my neighbor."

Although the radical personalism of the book seeks to be thoroughgoing, it is not fully empirical in method and in workmanship. This is perhaps inevitable in a semi-popular work of this kind. Dr. Farmer does not show

how the various theological doctrines which he expounds grow out of personality or a critical and coherent investigation of religious experience. He emphasizes doctrines which he does not take time to prove. Thus he lifts up the personal dimension in Christian theology and presents, as it were, a running commentary on the major established positions of conventional Christianity. This is not a book, then, for philosophical doubters who need an introduction to the intellectual or metaphysical outlines of Christianity; it gives rather a fresh touch to major Christian issues. The "radical personalism" is really middle of the road theology. Indeed, one wishes that Dr. Farmer might have come to grips with the experiential radicalism of a personalist like E. S. Brightman. The treatments of time and of the attributes of God are not radically personalistic; they are essentially mediaeval and are obscurantly held to though they "defy" our understanding.

Scholars in the field will note the absence of clear formulation of issues and precise definitions of terms. The avoidance of definitions seems to be studied. Unfortunately, this gives the discussion a certain dogmatic flavor. On the other hand, the essays are fresh and stimulating and will provide the average preacher with new homiletical handles for doctrinal sermons. In the Chapter, "Man the Sinner," the author draws soundly on the interpersonal solidarity of mankind, on the fact of freedom, on sin as impersonalism. The essay on love breaks through with arresting analyses.

The essay on "God's Action in Christ" displays a too narrowly historical perspective. It notes, quite properly, that "Christianity was never, and is not now, primarily a philosophy, an attempt to formulate a world view which shall comprehend so far as possible in one perspective everything of which we have knowledge and experience" (p. 98). But Dr. Farmer pays a penalty for the lapse from a broad philosophical perspective and is reduced to the necessity of special pleading for Christ in history. On the one hand, God, he says, is omnipotent, omniscient, eternal and infinite; on the other hand, his love seems to be revealed authentically only in one event of human history. One seeks in vain for that radical personalism which would recognize a wider authentic self-disclosure of God. Did not Christ, possibly, reveal a God whose revelations are universal? The chapter on "The Love of God" is rich in insights, but the full consequences of the theory of *agape* as radically personal in all human history are set aside for the all too frequently urged view which limits *agape* to the Church. "The idea of the Church is part of the Christian doctrine of God" (p. 167). That is sound; but what of the history of the whole human family before and alongside the Church? This weakness in his theory is not compensated for by the notion of ultimate restorationism (p. 176).

WALTER G. MUELDER

THE EVANGELISM OF A THEOLOGIAN

PILLARS OF FAITH, *by* NELS F. S. FERRÉ. *Harper & Brothers, $1.50.*

THIS is a beautiful little book, simple and devout, addressed fraternally to Christians of all communions and appealingly to all human beings who hope for a better world.

Ferré is engaged, as we know, upon a series of substantial volumes which will eventually cover all the technical topics of systematic theology. Here he turns aside to present quite untechnically and positively the five fundamentals on which the Christian faith has been based in successive eras — *all* of which, rightly conceived, are part of the basis on which faith can be securely founded in our age. They are: Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit, the Church, the Bible, and Experience.

There is deep theological reflection behind the book, of course, and where a theological issue threatens to divide Christians from one another or weaken the Gospel's impact on the world, Ferré does not hesitate to face it explicitly. So for example in Chapter III, "The Challenge of the Church," he tells the conservative Disciples and Southern Baptists (to whom these lectures were first delivered) that insistence upon baptism by immersion or closed communion destroys Christianity, which is a "fellowship in Christ's love transcending all external barriers." Again in Chapter IV, he takes sides both against an unhistorical literalism in the interpretation of Scripture, to which conservatives are addicted, and an unspiritual historicism to which liberals are addicted.

The general tone, however, is not controversial but evangelistic. Chapter I presents Christ as the answer to the three basic needs of our time: light upon our darkness concerning the meaning of our existence; forgiveness for the guilt that poisons our lives; and calmness in the presence of that ultimate "frustration of meaning" which is death. In a powerful figure, such as only a great evangelist could paint, and out of real compassion for the souls of his hearers, Ferré presents all human life as drifting down a swift river toward a final inescapable waterfall. The foolishness of pretending we are not concerned, not afraid! But there is one who has been "over the falls." With hardly less evangelistic power, he presents The Holy Spirit (Chap. II, p. 41) as *"the beginning of a new kind of life,"* in which we are "born into the family" by the "family Spirit . . . the Father's will in each of us as we are for, and with, the whole family." Chapter V, which might have been a somewhat barrenly technical discussion of rationalism and empiricism as factors in theological method, is actually a plea for a Christian experience which is "in Christ, through the Holy Spirit, within the fellowship of the Church, and regulated and fed by the Bible" (p. 107).

This is not only a book that will help the cause of the *universality* of the Church, it is one that will help in the *rebirth* of the Church, and so help in

the redemption of a disordered world. It would be good if every delegate at the Amsterdam Assembly might have read and pondered it.

WALTER M. HORTON

A RECORD OF NON-ECCLESIASTICAL ECUMENISM

A HISTORY OF THE WORLD'S YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION, *by* ANNA V. RICE. *The Woman's Press, $2.00.*

IT is highly suitable that at a time immediately preceding the formal organization of the World Council of Churches, there should have appeared this account of the life and work of the World's Young Women's Christian Association, covering the dates 1894–1946. Suitable, because, like the World's Student Christian Federation, the International Missionary Council, and the World's Y.M.C.A., the World's Y.W.C.A. has been, since as early as 1908, prophetic of world ecumenism.

Before the word ecumenical was used as freely and intelligently as it is used today, the most nearly equivalent word was "interconfessional." In 1910, in preparation for work in the Near East where the Eastern Orthodox churches and other Catholic movements were strong, the World's Y.W.C.A. fortified its general secretary with a resolution which says that this Association "Warmly welcomes as fellow laborers those of the Greek Orthodox or other Christian Churches who can sign the Basis and work in accordance with its teachings. . . ." In 1928, at its Budapest meeting, the World's Y.W.C.A., amidst some struggle and tension, reaffirmed its interconfessional position. In 1937 when the Oxford and Edinburgh conferences on Life and Work and Faith and Order were becoming the established milestones in the progress of the ecumenical movement the World's Y.W.C.A. took a natural and inevitable place among Christian and international groups looking toward a World Council of Churches and a true ecumenicity which should be broader and deeper than any since the earliest centuries of the life of the Christian Church.

In addition to the insights about Christian unity, the dramatic story told in these pages is significant for what it recounts of an awakened and operative social conscience, even as early as 1910: of the maintenance of Christian fraternity through two World Wars: of the methods of work by which democratic procedures were achieved; and of relationships with countries in which the religious predominance was non-Protestant or non-Christian.

Anna V. Rice, the author of this history, is well qualified indeed for the task of preparing it that she was asked to assume. After many years of Y.W.C.A. work she became the General Secretary of the National Board of the Y.W.C.A., acting at the same time as a member of the Executive Committee of the World's Y.W.C.A. She travelled in many of the countries described in her volume.

Miss Rice's review of the World's Y.W.C.A. is the biography of a movement. It is written with remarkable incisiveness, clarity, and brevity of detail. Although 267 pages long it is never laborious. It repeatedly catches the mood of an era in a forceful way. The fine quality paper, the heart-warming illustrations, the fine binding and printing as well as the artistic jacket do credit to the publisher.

There is being accumulated little by little, through the years, a remarkable library of Christian organizational documents: reports, essays, theological and missionary discussions, information and inspiration stemming from the churches and from the missionary, the Christian Association, and the student Movements. This new volume by Anna V. Rice is in every way worthy to take its place among these annals of ecumenism.

WINNIFRED WYGAL

THE SAVIOUR OF THE WORLD

THE DOCTRINE OF OUR REDEMPTION, *by* NATHANIEL MICKLEM. *Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, $1.50.*

PRINCIPAL Micklem of Mansfield College, Oxford, combines exceptionally well clarity with profundity of thought. Those who have read such of his works as *What Is the Faith?* and *The Theology of Politics,* and who have observed student reactions to them, know how he can go to the heart of the matter of the Christian faith by means of historical analysis which can be easily grasped. This book is no exception, and adds illustrative richness to basic analysis and clear writing. *The Doctrine of Our Redemption* is a good companion volume for layman and minister to Bishop Aulén's *Christus Victor.* Micklem's volume is more descriptive in a pluralistic sense than Aulén's but less polemically normative. It is less schematic in analysis, but at the same time less systematically suggestive.

The book's content takes up the doctrine of the atonement in the Old and New Testaments, in the Eastern Church, Augustine, the Middle Ages and the Reformation. The general point of view is that no theology is deep and broad enough to exhaust what God actually did for us redemptively in Jesus Christ. Any and all theories point to the exhaustless reality of that Event in history and of that Eternal Love that passes knowledge. The first chapter and the epilogue especially bring out the inner core of the book: Christ is not only the savior of the individual or even of the Church; for he effects a cosmic salvation; he saves *the whole world.* This theme is then expounded neither purely historically nor purely systematically, but is, rather, arrived at illustratively. History is bidden to call forth various aspects of certain ages or thinkers in order to produce this sense of the magnitude of Christ's work when looked at through many eyes and hearts in differing places and periods.

Principal Micklem refuses to live in the Ptolemaic world which would regard God as primarily the God of our earthly history. He therefore denies the fear-filled, man-motivated closing of God's history for us with human history, sending some pell-mell (and ready-made) into heaven forever, and some pell-mell into an eternally inescapable hell. He sees, rather, that Christian concern is particularly focussed on those who are not within the fold and that the compassion of Christ is not too small and too short-lived for them. Suggestively he points out how large a view some of the Fathers had on the subject. Yet he is, at the same time, afraid of introducing any laxness or false optimism into the picture. Here, however, he does not altogether succeed in keeping perspectives clear. In *the explanatory perspective,* if God as love is sovereign, there can be no eternal hell. If there is to be such a condition, God either would not or could not help it. If he would not, he is evil; if he could not, he is finite. But the sovereign God of the Christian faith has never surrendered the sovereignty of his freedom. Rather has he given man responsible freedom according to measure, a freedom which he completely conditions and controls according to the all-wise conditions of his creation. In *the existential perspective,* however, here can be no talk of eternal salvation. The only truth there is is that except we repent we shall all perish. God is not mocked nor will he abate one jot of his conditions. In him no sentimentality exists. Apart from our general acceptance of his ways for us we shall face trouble and catastrophe, yet we shall not escape from his continuing all-wise control and all-encompassing compassion. In this way God's love in Christ saves the whole world, while the conditions of this salvation are such as never to soften or falsify the seriousness of the Gospel.

NELS F. S. FERRÉ

ADORATIONS OF THE VIRGIN

THE WORLD'S GREAT MADONNAS, *by* CYNTHIA PEARL MAUS. *Harper & Brothers, $4.50.*

WHAT an amazingly comprehensive collection this is! Every major country of the world is here: all of Europe in the broad sense, including Russia; the Orient, China, India, and Japan; Africa, Central, West, and South; and the Western Hemisphere from Canada to Argentina. Every form of expression is represented, the literary, the graphic, and the musical. All the centuries are here, from the early church to the contemporary, and all the styles of art, from the crudest drawing of an African primitive to the sophisticated modernism of a Polish artist. The universality of the Christmas theme could scarcely be more graphically demonstrated.

So much in one book is possible, of course, only by rigid selection, and much that one has been accustomed to find in such anthologies has had to

be omitted. Commonly we have had prevailingly English verse and Italian madonnas. Instead, to make room for the rest of the world, these have had to content themselves here with reduced space. Since other anthologies are readily available one can only rejoice that here we are afforded so much of the unfamiliar and fresh. The selections are poignant and tender without lapsing into the sentimental. The work is an admirable manual to have at hand when Christmas approaches, alike for family reading and for public use in pulpit, pageant, and classroom.

A few rather random comments may not be amiss. The Japanese appear to have made the Christmas story less their own in artistic portrayal than have the Indians, Chinese, and Africans. A distinctively Japanese touch is evident only occasionally. That is to say, the delineation of the Virgin and Child and surroundings are not unmistakably Japanese; whereas the Chinese are manifestly Chinese, and African Madonna and Child are Negro unalloyed, and an Indian representation introduces even the sacred cow. Would all this go to show that the Japanese have been more imitative of the West?

The icons of Roguski, the Polish artist, are very interesting, modernistic in the sense that the theme has been in a measure subordinated to decorative effect. In the *Annunciation,* the rays of light cut across the picture like the fingers of a fan. The traditional lineaments of the theme are not effaced, however, while the disposition of spaces is singularly effective.

To select anything for quotation from the verse would be invidious, but just one example may serve to show in what far mines the compiler has quarried, and what gems have been unearthed. From Central West Africa comes a lullaby which begins:

> De li'l Jesus-baby
> Wuz cuddle' snug en fas'
> Ag'in de heaht o' Mary
> Lak twigs o' sassafras
> Dat clusters in de mammy tree
> En feels de sun go pas'.

Only one slip has been noted, a cautious slip, in that "Away in a Manger" is still attributed to Luther, though with some reservation. The statement is made that whoever wrote it, the carol "has lived through the centuries," and that little children the world around sing it today, "as did German children hundreds of years ago." But Richard S. Hill of the Library of Congress has demonstrated that "Away in a Manger" cannot be discovered in print prior to 1884, when it appeared in Pennsylvania in English. And the German version is not traceable earlier than 1934. See the article in "Music Library Association," December, 1945.

ROLAND H. BAINTON

A GREAT AND FRIGHTENING FRAGMENT

THE GRAND INQUISITOR, *by* FYODOR DOSTOEVSKY. *The Haddam House, $1.50.*

IT is interesting that Haddam House should have printed for The Association Press a new edition of the fifth chapter of Book Five of Dostoevsky's masterpiece *The Brothers Karamazov*. It is one of a new series copyrighted by The Edward W. Hazen Foundation and designed, both by format and content, to meet the reading interests of students and employed young people. In this latter respect it continues the inspiration out of which the Hazen Books on Religion grew.

The Committee responsible for selecting this classic obviously felt that it dealt with a moral problem of immediate concern to its intended readers. This is, in itself, significant. Why did it seem logical to follow books that with directness and a fair degree of simplicity deal with religious problems, with an imaginative story that Ivan, who tells it, calls "a rediculous thing," and that leads Alyosha, who hears it, to ask if it is not "a wild fantasy"? William Hubben, Master of George School who writes "Reflections on the Story" as the concluding section of the little book, thinks the story "rises from a moment of apostolic illumination," and observes further that "The Grand Inquisitor should be part of a Fifth Gospel if we might ever compose such a piece."

Readers of this review comment will for the most part have read the whole novel from which this famous section is lifted or will have read the chapter in one of its many reprints. The great and almost frightening argument need therefore not be repeated here. It is great in its profound insight into the problem of freedom vs. compulsion; it is terrifying in its plausibility. As fiction it makes no effort to be argumentative, but it nevertheless powerfully propounds the question whether the Cardinal or Jesus was right. Was Jesus wrong in offering freedom instead of bread? Has Rome that has offered bread to those who have surrendered their freedom to her, not "corrected" his work (as the Inquisitor put it)? These are questions that have been answered one way by idealist and Christian and another way by cynic and unbeliever. They contain the essence of policies that are being argued today by those who prefer food to freedom, physical security to political rights, and who, in the torment of their hunger and fear are exploited by every sort of totalitarian tyranny.

On which side did Dostoevsky stand? The complete novel must be read for the answer to that. At the same time the sudden and highly dramatic end of the interview in the cell after the Cardinal shouted to his Prisoner: "Tomorrow I shall burn Thee," gives a clue. The story says: "The old man (The Grand Inquisitor) longed for Him to say something, however bitter and terrible. But He suddenly approached the old man in silence and softly

kissed him on his bloodless lips. That was all His answer. The old man shuddered." To the author that strange response to the doom pronounced against him was the authentic gesture of the invincibility of Jesus.

Haddam House is to be congratulated for an excellent selection, printed in a fashion that by current postwar printing standards is lavish, illustrated by wood engravings of striking beauty (Fritz Eichenberg the artist) and annotated by one (Hubben) who has sensed the depth and relevance of the story for modern life and written of it engagingly.

EDWIN MCNEILL POTEAT

EVANGELISTIC IMPERATIVES AND ATOMIC DIFFUSENESS

THE UNITED NATIONS CHALLENGE TO THE CHURCH, *by* HUGH C. STUNTZ. *Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, $1.75.*

THE ATOMIC AGE AND THE WORD OF GOD, *by* WILBUR M. SMITH. *W. A. Wilde, $3.00.*

BOTH of these books deal with the religious implications of the Atomic Age. At this point likeness ceases: One is compact, liberal in spirit, social in outlook; the other is verbose, fundamentalist, and millenarian.

Dr. Stuntz, president of Scarritt College, outlines five basic principles set forth in the United Nations Charter in as many chapters: world unity, peace, respect for personality, justice, and freedom. He analyzes each with respect to its meaning, its present practice, or lack of it, among nations, and its implications for Christians. Each is conceived to be a fundamental Christian social principle to which the U.N. can and does subscribe in ideal but which it cannot establish without the spiritual resources of the Christian faith. The author challenges the church to produce in society an informed and imperative will to effectualizing action.

The book is readable in style and clear in thought, rather than moving or profound. Its weaknesses are a rather facile optimism with regard to the capacity of U.N. for peace and the power of the church to influence public opinion, and a slight tendency to be platitudinous.

The Atomic Age and the Word of God is a diffuse apocalyptic concerning the Bomb. The scriptural *pièce de résistance* is II Peter 3:7, 10–14. (The chapter headed "A Survey" quotes voluminously from nineteen centuries of biblical commentary thereon.) The author writes: "I do not mean by this that Peter here predicts the atomic bomb, but I do mean that *the principle involved in nuclear fission, which is at the base of the atomic bomb, is the principle which Peter here sets forth.*" (Page 132, author's italics.) Though prophetically predicted dates and identities are avoided, the author is certain that such scriptural phrases as "Prince of the Power

of the Air," "Wars and Rumors of War," "Armageddon," "Sodom and Gomorrah" – and their recurring use among secular writers – is of peculiar import for our time. He clearly suspects U.N. of being a prelude to the world dictatorship of Antichrist (Chapter X) and in characteristic premillenarian fashion sees in present world disaster and confusion clear evidence of Christ's imminent advent.

This volume represents compilation rather than authorship: roughly three-fourths of it is quotation. Leucippus, the Church Fathers, and Lord Rutherford are quoted on the atom. Appendices list all the Oxford Dictionary says under "atom" and "atomic," the ninety-six chemical elements, and other irrelevant details – of which latter the book is full. It will be read in some circles because of its title and pompous pretension to scholarship.

WINSTON L. KING

THE RUSSIA OF NICOLAS BERDYAEV

THE RUSSIAN IDEA, *by* NICOLAS BERDYAEV. *The Macmillan Company, $2.75.*

RUSSIAN thought, according to Berdyaev, has always been totalitarian in the sense of comprehending all departments of life. It is religiously motivated and humanistic in a distinctively Russian way, be it the thought of the intelligentsia of the Imperial period or of the contemporary Soviets. The Russian Idea has had a kind of coherence whether it expressed itself in lay or official Orthodoxy, Slavophilism or Westernization, religiosity or atheism, Romantic Slavophil patriarchalism or Russian Marxism. Some forty-five nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Russians are introduced and deftly characterized to illustrate the Russian Idea, while about forty lesser figures are brought in for confirmation. At the end of the book the contemporaries of Berdyaev are delineated and Berdyaev's own thought is summarized and placed in its historical context. The last chapter is for this reason perhaps the best part of the survey, making of the book a fitting finale to the tremendous literary labors of the great Orthodox-Marxist-Gnostic. The book can also serve as an appropriate introduction to the thought of Berdyaev.

The new material in the book, however, is actually rather limited. In the original Russian edition of 1946, the volume could scarcely have professed to be more than a reworking of earlier studies. But in the English edition, the compilatory character of the work is obscured by the failure of the publishers to provide it with a preface or foreword. The book opens to page one, chapter one, without even mentioning the translator. Without such a forewarning, the reader is distressed by the lack of order. While the chapter headings seem to indicate a certain chronological and topical development, actually the reworking of old material is so inadequately carried out that

one encounters Belinsky or Tolstoy or Soloviev at several points in the book or even the same chapter, treated afresh as though they had had no previous mention. Want of such reference increases the sense of *déjà-vu* to the point where one seems to be having an exciting but confused dream of the Russian nineteenth century. Some of the material of the book is taken almost verbatim from the author's *Origin of Russian Communism,* where the biographies and the intellectual histories came out more coherently than in the present conflated work. The author's previous studies of Mikhailovsky (1901), Khomiakov (1912), Dostoevski (1923), and Leontiev (1926) are also drawn into the present survey. Finally, much of the valuable material of Chapter IV on Russian humanism appeared in an article in *Theologische Zeitschrift* in 1946 along with an evaluation of Fritz Lieb's *Russland Unterwegs.*

Because of the composite character of the present survey and the want of adequate biographical characterizations of the numerous major and minor figures that come before one in rapid succession, a clear fixing of the principal thinkers and the main trends is very difficult for one not already somewhat familiar with the great names and leading movements dealt with. Nevertheless a sense of the theological, social, and political daring of the intelligentsia and a feeling for the tremendous emotional convulsions and the intellectual ferment of the Russian nineteenth century are a permanent residuum for even the casual reader of the volume. The book should be read twice and diligently compared with the earlier studies of the author if Berdyaev's Russia is to come clearly into focus; when this is achieved one can readily agree with him that while there have been five Russias (the first Kievan and the last Soviet), there is also one abiding Russia and one Russian Idea.

Writing in 1946 after the liberation of Paris, Berdyaev felt quite hopeful about the rise in the war-chastened Soviet of a new humanism, collective rather than individualistic, but with that cosmic undergirding which Berdyaev had always regarded as an essential safeguard against the inhumanity to which Western humanism degenerated. Berdyaev saw in Russian communism a distortion of the Russian messianic idea which he has traced for us through the nineteenth century. But Soviet communism is a Russian phenomenon, he insisted, ultimately traceable to Orthodox mentality. It is "the Russian destiny; it is a moment in the inner destiny of the Russian people and it must be lived through by the inward strength of the Russian people. Communism must be surmounted but not destroyed, and into the highest stage which will come after communism there must enter the truth of communism also but freed from its element of falsehood."

GEORGE H. WILLIAMS

THE RIGHT OF THEOLOGY TO A REALM OF ITS OWN

CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS, *by* ALAN RICHARDSON. *Harper & Brothers, $3.00.*

ALAN Richardson is a Canon of Durham Cathedral. He is one of the younger and obviously one of the "coming" theologians of his own Church. Books about religion are apt to betray the land and the denomination from which they come. This trait is certainly true of books which originate in American Protestantism. It is equally true of books which have their origin within the Church of England. Such books are often unconsciously insular and consciously Anglican. It is to be said of the book in hand that it is catholic, cosmopolitan, ecumenical. It is as relevant in America as in England, and in non-Anglican as in Anglican circles.

Canon Richardson finds Protestant theology living a beggar's life off other disciplines. So far from being the queen of the sciences, our theology feeds itself on crumbs that fall from the tables of the natural sciences, the sciences of man, and the philosophy of religion. Not only has theology lost its once regal reign over all other forms of reflective inquiry; it no longer has even a modest area of its own within which it can operate independently.

The author does not propose to re-enthrone theology as ruler over all the disciplines of the modern mind, but he does propose to recover for it a decent independence and therefore a proper self-respect. He intimates that we need not wait upon the findings of Freud, Pareto, Eddington, Einstein, and Toynbee before we say a word on our own account in behalf of religion.

Every science, he says, has its own proper bailiwick within which to prosecute its inquiries and it has also its own distinctive categories with which it works. Theology, as an empirical science, has therefore its own distinctive body of fact and its own methods. The unique datum with which theology works is the experience of the witnessing Christian Church. Its apparatus for interpreting Christian experience is relevant only to that experience. The old distinction between natural religion and revealed religion is restated as the difference between "general revelation" and "special revelation." The former category allows for pre-Christian and non-Christian faiths, but these faiths are said to tend toward self-defeat until fulfilled in the "special" Christian revelation.

The book defends a rigidly restricted theory of the nature of the science of theology at a time when most of the sciences are pulling down their fences and playing into each other's hands. But at the cost of this scientific "sectarianism" it does succeed in rescuing theology from its beggar-maid position and assigning it living quarters of its own and its own task.

WILLARD L. SPERRY

JESUS CHRIST, OUR LORD

CHRIST AS AUTHORITY, *by* CONRAD BERGENDOFF. *Augustana Book Concern, $1.50.*

THE one answer which the Christian Church can give to the earnest cry of our world, "Whom shall we serve?" is the person of Jesus Christ. Authority, for Christianity, does not reside in the Bible, or the Church, or a way of life, but in the "living, present, active, purposing, suffering, achieving Christ" (p. 13). Everything which President Bergendoff has to say centers in this affirmation.

The authority of Christ means "the authorship of faith in the Christian by a meeting between Him and the believer which results in a personal decision" (p. 21). In interpreting the meaning of this assertion for a Christian understanding of the Bible, nature, society, and the Church, the author vigorously resists any identification of the truth of Christ with finite patterns of truth or authority. Thus the understanding of the Bible as the Word of God is meaningless apart from an experience of the presence of him who speaks through it. In nature, the Christian sees the continuing creativity of the God revealed in Christ; he finds help in modern views of a world in process, but is not bound by changing scientific dogmas.

Occasionally, the reader may feel that in the vigor of Dr. Bergendoff's affirmation, there is a tendency to pass too lightly over important problems. For example, in his discussion of forgiveness as a social force, the author asserts that "the crucial point at which both our tangled social order and our confused private lives can find solutions is in the individual's confrontation by the Risen Christ" (p. 85). "Forgiveness is the force that energizes the people of God and produces an order of things different from that where unforgiven sins prevail and thrive" (p. 89). But can we stop here, with no further word as to the nature of the order which forgiveness produces?

When he speaks of the authority of Christ in relation to the unity of the Church, the author is most specific and most persuasive. The corruption of Christ's authority into an authority of dogma or church has conspired with ignorance to produce prejudice and intolerance within the body of Christ. The solution is not the elimination of differences, but the conciliar method, which accepts the fundamental community of the churches in relation to Christ and is willing "to distinguish where distinctions exist, and to identify (and unite) where there are not distinctions" (p. 134). That this theme is close to his heart, is evident from Dr. Bergendoff's activity in the ecumenical conferences and his efforts toward unity among the branches of the Lutheran Church.

CLAUDE WELCH

CHRIST AND CHRISTIAN THOUGHT IN POETRY

THE CHRIST OF THE POETS, *by* EDWIN MIMS. *Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, $2.50.*
POETS OF CHRISTIAN THOUGHT, *by* HENRY M. BATTENHOUSE. *The Ronald Press, $2.50.*

HERE are two books which belong together. I say that they belong together because, curiously enough, these two widely separated men and minds discuss somewhat the same poets: Milton, Tennyson, Browning, Emerson, Eliot.

Through all the years that I can remember this idea of getting out books centering around the Christian or spiritual teachings of the great poets has fascinated the teacher-preacher type of mind. I have published two or three of them myself; and have been greatly enamoured of others which have been published from time to time because they furnish practical aids in preaching. Audiences are always interested in poetry, especially in Christian poets. The first book I ever wrote was entitled *Giant Hours with Poet Preachers,* the second, *Flames of Faith.* Both of them dealt with great spiritual and Christian teaching in the poets. They were somewhat in the mood and format of the two fine books now under review. This formulae is always a sure-fire one with preachers and teachers, and every generation sees several such books spring into print.

The two present books, however, are written more in the academic mood than in the preaching mood. They sound as if they had been delivered as lectures before English classes; and that doesn't hurt them any with the poetry lover; for one feels the atmosphere of authority in them. With this basic sense of fine organization and what I like to call "the eloquence of facts" in them the average preacher can glean what he wishes and needs for his Christian preaching from either or both of them, and can go on to glory from there. Both books are rich gold mines for preaching and it will repay any man to dig into them for nuggets of ideas, illustrations and great sentiments exalted by rhyme and rhythm.

WILLIAM L. STIDGER

OPENING THE DOOR TO THE WRITTEN WORD

TEACHING THE WORLD TO READ, *by* FRANK C. LAUBACH. *Friendship Press, $2.00.*

THE title of this book sounds pretentious and yet it is accurately expressive of the movement it describes. Everyone knows by now of the work of Frank Laubach begun among the Moros of Mindanao. It centers in a simple, scientific method of teaching illiterate adults — or children, for that matter — to read the language they speak. In many cases, as with the

Moros, the language has never been reduced to writing; there is then the task of constructing an alphabet. For some languages this is easier than for others, for the basic sounds of the language are few and relatively simple. For others with more sounds, it is somewhat more difficult.

The method is phonetic and starts with a simple sentence which contains all the sounds of the language. There is one letter for each sound which makes it a matter of hours to learn to read. The next step is to teach the newly literate man to teach someone else, and that is the next step in a program of widening literacy which, ideally, would increase with geometric progression. For many years Dr. Laubach has been going about in Asia, Africa and Latin America, with hearty co-operation of governments, educators and missionaries, starting and giving the initial impulse to literacy movements using this essential method. All this is well known.

But in this book we discover that the simple and effective method of teaching illiterates to read has carried Dr. Laubach into the whole program and philosophy of this type of education. He has made great and indispensable contributions to that program himself and he has increasingly enlisted in it the leading workers in many lands. The syllabus of this book, he tells us, was begun at Teachers' College, Columbia University, with the aid of a number of collaborators, in 1943. The work of experts in phonetics, in the making of word lists and in methods of teaching has been drawn upon. As a result this constitutes "A Handbook for Literacy Campaigns," with detailed accounts of their organization and operation and with copious illustrations of the materials to be used.

Ninety percent of the languages of the world, says Dr. Laubach, can be spelled phonetically. Chief among those that cannot is English. There is a section, however, showing how even this orthographically irrational language can be managed by the phonetic method. In a supplement there is a report of a round-table discussion on "The Phonetic Problem in China," and the validity of the phonetic method in the teaching of that language is hopefully urged.

Dr. Laubach is primarily a Christian missionary and he sees this world literacy campaign directly in the line of the dissemination of the Christian gospel. Teaching people to read has always been a first step in Protestant missionary work because it puts the open Bible in their hands. There is another and valuable accessory aid to the teaching of Christianity in teaching men to read. Laubach makes it a matter of method and principle that the teacher shall sit down with the learner and dispense with all show of superiority. In this kindly and democratic helpfulness the essence of Christianity is being communicated while a basic method of further study is being acquired. Laubach always tells, as he does here, of the wonder and joy with which illiterate adults discover that they can read. It gives them

self-confidence and opens wider horizons. This is often the beginning of spiritual as well as mental development. The enlistment of the newly-taught as teachers takes them further in the Christian meaning of life in that they become helpers of others to the new freedom.

This process, of course, never works out to its full possibilities. The inertia of most men has to be dealt with, and so there are plans described, based on much experience, for the organizing of literacy campaigns, for the selection and training of workers and for their vigorous prosecution. The fruit of all these years of work is to be found not only in the millions who now can read because of it but also in a movement now equipped with adequate methodology and inspired with a spirit of hope and enthusiasm.

HUGH VERNON WHITE

THE GLAMOUR OF THE BIBLE RECAPTURED

STORIES OF THE BOOK OF BOOKS, *by* GRACE W. MCGAVRAN. *The Friendship Press, $1.50.*

WHEN you stop to think about our nonchalant treatment of the Bible, by far the most inexplicable aspect has been our isolation of this Book on remote pulpits in church and on inconspicuous tables in the home; until children grow up, and wed, and die under the impression that this dull volume is of little consequence to anybody but clergymen and earnest Sunday school teachers.

One wise way to restore its lost lustre has been taken recently by the Missionary Education Movement in a series of new study books about the introduction of the Bible into other lands: for there is great glamour and authenic adventure in the thrill of translation and the drama of distribution; while the power of such priceless pages to transform whole populations awakens a wholesome interest.

Every mother and every teacher and every child needs to know what Grace McGavran tells in her thirty-one *Stories of The Book of Books,* and ministers in search of quotable material for story sermons will find that the adults in the average congregation will be as enchanted as the children by the tales this little volume contains. For here is history of the church wrapped up in the men, women, and children who found the Book exciting, disturbing, demanding — and worth cherishing even in the face of persecution and imprisonment.

Miss McGavran begins with a brief overall picture of "How our Bible came to be"; then, from the Middle Ages to the present day, she gives graphic accounts of how Britain, India, China, Africa and the isles of the sea received and preserved and passed on the precious words. The imperishable "Gospels of Lindesfarne," the trials of Tyndale, the Mar Thoma

Church of India which had no Bible, the pioneers who braved savages and starvation and prison to get the Bible into Ireland and England and the Orient and South America: all these stories are told, and many more; making the Book seem a prized possession indeed.

MARGARET APPLEGARTH

PREACHING FROM MODERN SHORT STORIES

THE LOST GOSPEL, *by* ROBERT E. LUCCOCK. *Harper & Bros., $1.75.*

THE Gospel is a way of life, which means that nothing in life is foreign to it. The preacher needs to develop what someone has called "the homiletical mind," which sees illustrations of Christian truth everywhere. Woe unto the man who is content to confine his sermon material to any single source.

Certainly one of the great fields for the preacher is literature, and one of the main sub-divisions of that field is the short story. Robert E. Luccock has written this book of sermons built around sixteen short stories. The idea itself is an excellent one, but it could have gone wrong if the author had not had the background and taste to choose worthy stories. He has chosen with skill. These stories themselves are fresh and significant. That means that any preacher will find sixteen wonderful ideas here to explore further according to his own taste and style.

As if this were not enough, Robert Luccock's treatment of each short story is superb. This is true in the first place because of what he does not do. He does not twist the stories to make them mean something the author did not have in mind. He does not over-emphasize unimportant points. In other words, his refusal to misuse the stories is in itself a fine pattern for preachers to follow.

But his positive use of the material is a joy to behold. Here are sermons that are clearly organized and sharply outlined. One has the feeling that each point comes with a kind of inevitability. There is the right use of illustration, which is to say, there is enough and not too much.

One catches the sparkle of Robert Luccock's father, which is about as high a compliment as one preacher could pay to another. Yet, there is no doubt that here is a young man who also has a style of his own and will make his own unique contribution to our contemporary preaching.

GERALD KENNEDY

"I PREFER TO HOPE"

HIGH HORSE RIDERLESS, *by* L. T. C. ROLT. *The Macmillan Company, $2.75.*

IN an earlier book, *Narrow Boat,* our author described his leisurely wanderings along the half-derelict canals of England. That book, like the Introduction to this, revealed a man restless with discontent, wearied of

the tawdriness of our manufacts and seeking a free life of his own. In this present and more reflective work, Mr. Rolt sketches (very roughly) British social history from "the age of faith" to the present day. He is at his best in the second of the three parts of his book.

This central section gives a graphic description of Western civilisation, the "high horse riderless." The machine has become more important than men, and the joy and self-fulfilment of the craftsman are almost entirely lost. The village "reveals a communal unity, . . . its modern equivalent sprawls witlessly . . . displaying a blank and alien individualism." Living conditions "present superficially a striking improvement" but the woman of the house has been " 'emancipated' by science from the exercise of a craft which shares with that of agriculture the distinction of being the oldest in the world." "Not only (are) the house and its contents intrinsically worthless and graceless but the whole crazy impermanent structure rests on the quicksand of usury" (hire purchase). Increased leisure finds us far less qualified than our fathers for its satisfying use. Slogans are mistaken for ideas. The arts have become mere arts-and-crafts. "Scientific progressivism" has paved the way for totalitarianism, and "if the pre-war economic strife and civil restlessness which led up to the present cataclysm were the result of the utter lack of relationship between industrial resources and human needs, on what a vast scale these conditions will be aggravated after the war by the world-wide extension of those resources."

The third, constructive section of the book is a plea for the elimination of uncreative work, for the fullest use of local resources, for the re-basing of society on a prosperous and populous agricultural community and for the application of the principles of natural law to education. In common with so many of the more thoughtful malcontents of our day, the writer (who complains that in his schooldays he was given "a surfeit of religious moralism unrelated to life" and "an overdose of pietism" which he found "equally indigestible") is groping his way towards a new philosophy, a Christian interpretation of life. He shows no acquaintance with the sociological thought which has characterised the life of the Christian Church, on both sides of the Atlantic, for more than a generation past.

For want of understanding of the esssential Christian witness, our author's present position may be epitomised in words he uses in his Introduction: "I prefer to hope."

Of all the evidence of man's lost estate, none is more persistent or more fundamental than the antithesis we make between the individual and the community. Mr. Rolt shares that misconception. "As a first step it is of absolutely vital importance that we learn that all planning for the future must start with the individual and not with the community." Until we have come to see, as Paul sees, that the individual finds in Christ his fulness in

the community — the new man in the New Man — the diagnosis of our ills is incomplete and the cure proposed is, as in this book, but superficial.

ALAN BALDING

A COMPANIONABLE BOOK

THE ENGLISH COUNTRY PARSON, *by* WILLIAM ADDISON. *J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., $3.75.*

THIS is a companionable book, and when my conscience-pricking friends exhort me to send to Germany or China no book which I do not myself highly prize, then this one will have to be yielded with a pang. It is a book to keep and read again and to open anywhere. There is little more of plot than in the perennial sequences of winter and of spring. Country parsons have not been too different throughout the ages. In every generation there have been those who for forty or fifty or by reason of strength sixty years built themselves into the life of a parish until they knew its every bairn and bird and berry. Hunting parsons some of them were, to be sure, but the greater part were "gentlemanly old rectors with beautiful manners and fine libraries," fathers of numerous families, often of famous sons, authors themselves of numerous books. Quaint were they, eccentric, inimitably individual, devoted, and inexpressibly beloved. One understands after reading this book why men love the Church of England, why men love England too, why men love the Church anywhere.

The author is a gentle, witty, mellow spirit, perhaps not so old, but wise, loathing extremes, yet able to see that upheavals are needful, rebellions are fruitful, and even excesses may yield something of good. Yet, alas, so often they throw out the baby with the bath, and to warn against this is one of the missions of the book. Change is on us now, and change we must if we would live; but let us not more than we need, lose the grace of bygone days and the simple ways of those who lived close to the good earth, the open air, and the breath of God.

The book is a history, a picture of country parsons from the Middle Ages to our time. A discerning picture is given of the culture and character of village life in each period, and then the role of the village parson is illustrated by some half dozen examples for each century. No inhibitions have cheated this work of spice. The anecdote is related, for example, of a hunting parson who, when rebuked with the observation, "I don't see in my Bible that the apostles went out shooting," retorted, "No, sport was bad in Palestine. They went fishing instead." And no reverence for the cloth has excluded the quip of Sidney Smith:

> The curate's eyes my daughters praise,
> I never see their light divine;
> He always shuts them when he prays,
> And when he preaches — I shut mine.

And, there are very delectable cartoons. Confound the friend who persuades me to give this book away!

ROLAND H. BAINTON

A STAB AT THE SLUMBERING CONSCIENCE

THE CHRISTIAN WAY IN RACE RELATIONS, *edited by* WILLIAM STUART NELSON. *Harper & Bros., $2.50.*

THIS little book is guaranteed to unsettle the complacency of an easy conscience and to fortify the courage of a timid one. Its word is realistic; its mood factual; its argument irrefutable; its attack on color caste a labefaction.

Caucasians who argue, "But Negroes *want* to be with their own people!" will get no satisfaction from these words of thirteen leaders of Negro America. Christians who contend, "But we must be practical!" will here discover that the sands of time are so nearly run out that gradualism spells catastrophe. Secularists who think they have the only soundly radical approach to and cure for the ills of racism will look to their specious laurels as this book gets its deserved hearing.

The Dean of Howard University's School of Religion opens the argument. Morehouse College's George Kelsey states the guiding principles (which are singularly neo-orthodox in his case). Neal Hughley of North Carolina College, Arthur Hardy of the National Council of YMCA's, and Harlem's James Robinson assess the basic difficulties in economics, politics, and society generally. Tuskegee's Harry Richardson surveys the institutional resources of the Church, followed by Knoxville's President Imes, Lincoln's Frank Wilson, the YWCA's (and Brooklyn College's) Marion Cuthbert, and the Federal Council's George Haynes, who write chapters on the Christian college, the YM and YWCA's, and social and civic organizations. President Mays of Morehouse uses his scalpel with surgical exactness on the individual conscience. And finally, Howard Thurman of San Francisco and Richard McKinney of Storer College speak the words of judgment and hope.

I stake whatever reputation I may have as a long-time writer and worker in this field, on this book. It is stalwart without being offensive. It is as aggressive as the Christian faith. I recommend it.

It may at one or two points be overly sure of the final truth of the neo-orthodox position and slightly patronizing in its assessment of the late lamented social gospel; but these are limitations common to many current books in the field of religion. It may not be too complete in its specific cataloging of the next steps to be taken; but there are plenty of handbooks of race relations which suggest easy steps for little feet.

What these writers have done – and what desperately needs to be done

again and again and again — is to stab the slumbering conscience of Christian America. There is a strength in the churches which, a century ago, was unleashed against the sin of slavery. The attack on color caste is long overdue.

BUELL G. GALLAGHER

THE TRIUMPHAL MARCH OF FAITH

TOMORROW IS HERE, *by* KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE *and* W. RICHEY HOGG. *Friendship Press, $1.50.*

THE doctrine of the communion of saints is particularly congenial to the church historian, who seeks in terms of what has been to interpret what now is and to project what is to be. The parochial Christian tends to be myopic both in time and space. The foreign missionary enterprise is the ecumenical movement in its most dynamic planetary aspect, at the point where the church reaches out to all men everywhere and imaginatively plans for the evangelization of all the generations to come. For the church as a creative fellowship, tomorrow has always been here. Perhaps never before, however, has the future for all social organizations, including the church, been so telescoped into the now.

The tomorrow that is already here is at present most unlovely. To the faithless, its obvious tragedies are inevitable grounds for unavoidable despair. To the apostolic fellowship of goodwill, times like these throb with the pulsing expectancy of the New Testament age. Here is stark reality — man's confusion; here also is the thrust of the eternal into the contemporary — God's design. Ecclesiasts comprehend this with their minds; the mission enterprise, evolving into a fellowship where the lines between "older" and "younger" churches are fading out with accelerated rapidity, feels it in its heart, and accordingly sets its will resolutely toward its overwhelming and so much the more thrilling task. Here, in the global ranges of the life of the church one hears the lilt of songs of expectation. Not here, if ever, the shallow optimism of merely human progress, but rather the deep chanting voice of faith: "and He shall reign for ever and ever," to whom "every knee shall bow." Add to rhapsody sacrifice, add to ecstasy hard work, and you have foreign missions.

Convene a hundred people from every corner of the earth, of every tribe and kindred, at Whitby in Ontario under the auspices of the International Missionary Council, commission two exceptionally competent scribes to interpret the three weeks' happenings there, in all of which they were a part, and you have this little book of 145 pages. One should follow its reading with careful study of the formal statements of the Conference, "The Witness of a Revolutionary Church," a document likely to be definitive for centuries to come.

For any Christian, parson or lay person, eager to know the answer of faith to the thunderous dawn of days like these, *Tomorrow Is Here* is unreservedly recommended.

Ross W. Sanderson

INTIMATE REACTION TO AN INTIMATE BOOK

High Wind at Noon, *by* Allen Knight Chalmers. *Charles Scribner's Sons, $2.50.*

HIGH Wind – an immanent social hurricane causing spiritual tension – comes upon us "midway upon the journey of our life" – at noon. Dr. Chalmers, with devotional intensity, presents "the case for a Christianity daring enough to believe in perfection," ergo strong enough to brave the blast.

This book will doubtless be well liked by people who like this sort of book. That is a verdict that will stand. In truth, a great deal of literature falls under this judgment, especially the intimate literature: poetry, the informal essay, humor, and most religious literature – particularly that of a devotional character. The more intimate a writer is, the warmer the response of those who feel things that way. The rest of the readers line up from uncomfortable, through offended, to disgusted.

I was uncomfortable. On page 42 the author quotes "the touch of hidden fingers." All through the book I felt those hidden fingers working on my soul, and at times I found myself getting jumpy. Dr. Chalmers writes vividly in this "case for a daring Christianity." There are first-rate anecdotes in the pages, but just when I would give myself up to mirth or drama, I would be startled to see the author bearing down on me for more massage on my ganglia.

Dr. Chalmers has a disconcerting way of altering quotations to fit his purposes, albeit noting the changes. (Cf. p. 111, "The last lines were changed just a bit to make us think of our present day.") My own technique is to misquote and let it go. Another characteristic of the author's style is his frequent allegations of the reader's thought. I found myself protesting vainly that I hadn't thought any such thing when he said what he did – that I don't use that kind of language when I talk to myself. I sympathize with my friend, a lady of the manse, who took driving lessons from a hearty garage mechanic. "You'll be shifting gears," he told her, "and you'll hear a grinding, and you'll say to yourself, 'Now what the blank did I do wrong to the blank thing this time?' " (I have altered the quotation a bit to suit the occasion.) The lady of the manse conceded the problem but objected to the way it was presented. So do I. This is a very personal reaction to a volume of personal reactions. As a review, it will doubtless be liked by people who like this sort of review.

Ronald Bridges

AN UNCRITICAL UTOPIA

THE RECONSTRUCTION OF HUMANITY, *by* PETIRIM A. SOROKIN. *The Beacon Press, $3.00.*

PETIRIM Alexandrovitch Sorokin was born in Russia in 1889. He was educated in Russia where he held his earliest academic positions. He was banished by the Communist government. Since 1930 he has been at Harvard University. His field is sociology and he has published many books. Dr. Sorokin has an interesting and at times a baffling mind. In the present volume *The Reconstruction of Humanity* he deals with a problem of first class proportions with a great show of exhaustive analysis and logical precision. But, as Professor Robert M. MacIver of Columbia observes in a review of the book in the *New York Times Book Review* of April 18, 1948, he supports his contentions by the dubious use of dubious statistics. There is again and again a process of oversimplification in which essential elements of the matter under discussion are ignored, as when he uses the number of wars in which democracies have participated, in comparison with those of autocracies, as an argument showing the ineffectiveness of democracy as a force making for peace. He manages to invent a new God to whom he gives the name Infinite Manifold. And the force upon which he ultimately depends for transformation is a curious blend of the pantheistic monism of India and forms of mysticism which have appeared in the Christian religion. The keen reader of impatient mind is likely to paraphrase Horace and exclaim: "The mountain was in travail and brought forth an uncritical Utopia." Precariously constructed structures of analysis lead to inadequately buttressed conclusions.

However, there is really more to be said. Often, as in his criticism of Freudian psychology, Professor Sorokin is brilliantly acute. And all through the book there are shrewd and penetrating observations well worth pondering. The author is obviously on the side of the angels and really wants good things for the sons of men – good in character as well as in social organization. If the book falls short of being a first class piece of work, it is a most effective revelation of an earnest mind groping for the light.

LYNN HAROLD HOUGH

THE AUTHORITY OF EXPERIENCE

PSYCHOLOGY FOR PASTOR AND PEOPLE: A BOOK ON SPIRITUAL COUNSELING, *by* JOHN SUTHERLAND BONNELL. *Harper & Bros., $2.50.*

FROM FAILURE TO FULFILMENT: A MINISTER'S NOTEBOOK ON PSYCHOLOGICAL METHOD, *by* JOHN MARTIN. *The Macmillan Co., $2.00.*

THESE small readable books on ministering to individuals should be satisfying to pastors and other readers for several reasons (in spite of the fact that each is priced a dollar too high).

The authors reflect a first-hand and fortunate acquaintance with Holy Scripture. In fact, each goes beyond personal knowledge of The Book. For to a remarkable extent each is The Book. And how refreshing it must be to sufferers to find out from a practicing pastor, that there's something in Holy Scripture besides the twenty-third psalm, the eighth of Romans, and the fourteenth chapter of John.

Another reason why these books should be most acceptable to pastors, is that these writers have studied the psychologies of personality and psychotherapeutic methods. And, so far as I can see, they have understood what they have studied. This has not been true of many of the books by ministers who have felt impelled to share with others what they thought they knew about psychology. These writers, in addition to "objective sympathy," express the results of "subjective discipline (informed caution)" and "true compassion." They can do this because they have themselves gone beyond "the itch to help" and have reached that level of "devotion through which God redeems the lost."

I am amazed that these writers can tell stories about so many people and touch upon so many phases of personality, and yet be so brief.

Finally, here are pastors who have been working long enough with troubled people in clinical situations (where two or three are gathered together "in his name," i.e. testing for the real, the true, the things of good report) to be in position to speak as persons having authority — not as the scribes. So what a relief to us practicing pastors, as well as to the troubled and anxious whom these ministers serve, to ask of them bread and actually received bread in gracious return.

As these books prove, each author is "a mighty rock within a weary land" because he has appropriated and inwardly digested Holy Scripture, because he has informed himself as to psychological theory and method by means of hygienic thinking; and because he has himself borne the burden and the heat of the day.

AUSTIN P. GUILES

DID PETER WRITE AN EPISTLE?

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER. *The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes, edited by* FRANCIS WRIGHT BEARE. *The Macmillan Company, $3.50.*

PROFESSOR Beare, who is on the staff of Trinity College in the University of Toronto, received the first impetus for the present volume many years ago from Hort's uncompleted work on the Epistle. He confesses to "an ineffaceable impression" of the skill of that master craftsman and to the effect of the latter's efforts upon his own thinking. His commentary — as

the subtitle suggests — contains the Greek text. But, having in mind "the reader who knows little or no Greek," the author translates most of the Greek words and so phrases his argument generally that a deficiency at this point offers no serious handicap to the student. In format the book gives the impression of being a cross between Sanday and Headlam's *Romans* and Armitage Robinson's *Ephesians* (the English half only), — a useful combination for the achievement of his purpose.

Professor Beare's *Introduction* consists of the usual discussion relative to the text, authorship, date, theme and general character of the Epistle. He appends a useful Bibliography, ending with Selwyn's work which appeared in 1946 too late for him to use. It is extremely doubtful whether the latter would have greatly appealed to him, as the two commentaries are at opposite poles in their conclusions on the topics above mentioned. Selwyn believes the author to have been Peter, Beare is assured that he was not: "The true author remains hidden from us by the veil which he has himself chosen to draw" (p. 31). The former dates the Epistle in 63 or early in 64, the latter about 111–112 (p. 14). Again, whereas Selwyn conceives of the persecutions noted in the Epistle as the sporadic local actions of the mob or even police, Beare sees in them the organized opposition referred to in the correspondence of Pliny the Younger and the Emperor Trajan. Moreover, as we should expect from the foregoing, Selwyn accepts Rome as the *locus* from which the letter was written: its readers are residents of Asia Minor *north of Paul's special churches,* and Mark and Silvanus are really the persons bearing these names (5:12–14). For Beare on the other hand "the mention of Mark and Silvanus, and also of Babylon, has no significance except as part of the device of pseudonymity" (p. 31), and the territory described includes that evangelized by Paul — a clear anacronism! Finally, Beare accepts the suggestions of Perdelwitz and Streeter that the Epistle is composed of a "baptismal discourse" (1:3–4:11) incorporated into a genuine letter (1:1.2 and 4:12–5:14), and of Goodspeed that it belongs to the corpus of Christian writings succeeding the publication of the Pauline literature and headed by the "deutero-Pauline Ephesians" (p. 9). Selwyn rejects both of these hypotheses in the form here stated.

This comparison is offered both because it illustrates how two modern scholars working with the same materials and referring to the same primary and secondary sources can come to diametrically opposed conclusions, and also because it serves to point up Professor Beare's general position. It remains to be said that the commentary before us — while in many particulars the present reviewer would wish to take strong exception from the author's conclusions — is the work of a first-rate scholar who knows his sources, whose insights are many, and whose general view is deeply Christian. The book is readable and the general student will find it thought-

provoking and stimulating. There are several errors in printing, notably the two "ands" in the German quotation on p. 27 and the "*upon* men" half way down the page on p. 39.

JOHN WICK BOWMAN

GOSPELS AND EPISTLES

THE FOUR GOSPELS. A NEW TRANSLATION, *by* CHARLES CUTLER TORREY. Second edition. *Harper & Brothers, $2.50.*

LETTERS TO YOUNG CHURCHES. A TRANSLATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT EPISTLES, *by* J. B. PHILLIPS, *with an introduction by* C. S. LEWIS. *The Macmillan Company, $2.50.*

PROFESSOR TORREY'S *The Four Gospels* was first published in 1933. During the intervening fifteen years, scholars have studied his work and have weighed the probability of his theory of original Aramaic gospels. The author himself has been busy reinforcing and further strengthening his position. First came *Our Translated Gospels* (1936), which was a detailed presentation of "some of the evidence," with an introduction which set forth the theory in persuasive terms and described the conditions under which Professor Torrey believes the Aramaic Gospels were written. The evidence was accurately classified and tabulated: cases of ambiguity in the Aramaic text, now reflected in the Greek: questions understood as declarations; examples of redundant "and"; the reflexive pronoun and its substitute; wrong evaluation of the Aramaic; and corruptions in the Aramaic text – in the Aramaic lying behind the Greek. Two other works have also been produced by the author, each with a bearing upon this theory: *Documents of the Primitive Church* (1941) and *A Brief Introduction to the Apocryphal Literature* (1945). He is convinced that his theory has gained ground and cites the names of several scholars who have given it their approval – though, conspicuously, the new Revised Standard Version (1946) has not taken over Dr. Torrey's proposed changes. (He calls it the "American Standard Revision" on p. xi!)

The principal changes in rendering (from the first edition) are listed on pp. v–vi. They will be of great interest to all who have read and used the first edition.

No one in America has done more – no one else has done as much as Dr. Torrey – to bring out the underlying Aramaic in the sayings of Jesus and in the older pericopes of the gospel tradition. His work is like Wellhausen's, always stimulating, always provocative, always turning new shafts of light upon dark corners. But in undertaking to prove that the gospels circulated as Aramaic writings in Palestine in the days before 70 A.D., Dr. Torrey is attempting the impossible. It is not only that the evidence is in-

sufficient; the probabilities are against the theory. For one must not only prove that Aramaic gospels *could* circulate in Palestine at that early date, but that they *did* so circulate, and that our four are the gospels which circulated, and that the resulting picture of the rise and expansion of Christianity, the development of Christian thought, the extension of the church, the growth of early Christian literature, is improved. Dr. Torrey's theory challenges the whole modern reconstruction of the history of early Christian literature. As Emerson said to the youthful O. W. Holmes, after hearing his school-essay on Plato: "When you shoot a lion, you must be sure to kill him."

Letters to Young Churches is scarcely a translation, but a paraphrase — and a rather wordy one. Paul's style, for example — nervous, compressed, saltatory, his thought leaping from point to point like an electron, apparently without the necessity of traversing the intervening space — this amazing and characteristic style is lost in a paraphrase. Yet paraphrases are useful — and needful, in Paul's letters — and they seem to be coming back into vogue. (Archbishop Wand recently republished one giving us Paul's epistles in a bishop's "pastoral letter" diction and style!) But it is to be hoped that after the reader has gone through a good paraphrase he will turn to a real translation — or better, to the original Greek text. To keep on with the paraphrase after it has served its purpose is like relying on crutches when they are no longer needed!

Mr. C. S. Lewis contributes an interesting Introduction, chiefly concerning the inadequacy of the A.V. and recommending Dr. Moffatt's translation of Von Soden's Greek and Msgr. Knox's translation of the Vulgate. Mr. Phillips includes the Pastorals as letters of Paul, and Hebrews as addressed "to Jewish Christians" (perhaps written "jointly by Paul and Apollos" in A.D. 67); the epistle of James as "almost certainly" by "James, brother or step-brother of Jesus." In short, the author's views are extremely conservative. Second Peter is "the only letter of the New Testament whose authenticity has been disputed" (p. 203). What good purpose, religious or spiritual, intellectual or theological, is served by such ultra-conservatism, I do not know.

It is often said that the best part of the new R.S.V. is the Pauline letters; the same is true of this volume. Perhaps in both cases the improvement is due to the natural difficulty of Paul's style, so that a good, readable translation is almost a miracle! Yet on some passages, e.g. Galatians 3:20 (which is almost beyond explanation), the paraphrase represents only a guess, though a good one. In Philippians 2:6, the author's conservative theology leads him to read later post-Athanasian orthodoxy into the verse. But in general the paraphrasing of Paul is very well done.

FREDERICK C. GRANT

GREAT PREACHING ON GREAT THEMES

HAVE THIS MIND, *by* GERALD KENNEDY. *Harper and Brothers, $2.00.*

THESE sermons deal with the great themes of Christian faith – revelation, the Holy Spirit, salvation, forgiveness, the church, the kingdom, the life eternal, the final triumph. Through them all runs the preacher's deep conviction that "only an awakening to the need for the heroic acceptance of Christ's way can save us. Only preaching with a terrible sense of urgency is of any avail now." Dr. Kennedy throws new light on old truths, reveals fresh insights into the deeper meanings of the ancient gospel, and brings a penetrating mind and a fine spirit to bear upon the truth as he finds it in Christ.

In a sermon on the church he says: "No one can expect great preaching in every church and at every service. But one ought to expect careful preparation and hard work behind the sermon. Too many sermons are careless and show the touch of an undisciplined mind. There is a sort of casualness about them that is not fitting for the delivery of an urgent message." There is nothing of the undisciplined mind in Dr. Kennedy's own preaching. His sermons betray not the slightest attempt to display erudition or cleverness, but behind a disarming simplicity they reveal a profound knowledge of history, philosophy, and human life. He goes swiftly to the point with the directness of a man whose one concern is the proclamation of a message. He never drags in an illustration, or manufactures a labored metaphor, but his pages are illumined by references to life and literature which seem inevitable. The outline of every sermon is bold and clear, but it is not the kind of outline contrived by the man who asks "What shall I say?", but rather that of the man who out of a full mind sifts basic convictions in response to the challenge "What must be said?"

Here are a few samples of his incisive thought:

Whenever men flee from the authority of truth, they finally end up captive in the prison of superstition.

If the Church persecutes the prophets, the Church also produces them.

Christians find that a seeming impossibility holds an unescapable fascination for them, as if the Spirit were tempting them to undertake it.

We built a little hall of mirrors until the constant looking at ourselves makes us dizzy with hopelessness.

Christians can never explain the Resurrection because it is the Resurrection that explains them.

This reviewer is sorry that Dr. Kennedy hopes that we shall never have an organic union of the churches. He would like to belong to Dr. Kennedy's church. He is thankful that any church has a preacher producing sermons like these which are such good sense, good religion and good reading. They must have been good hearing, too.

MORGAN PHELPS NOYES

EDUCATION FOR GENUINE CONVICTION

THE RELATION OF RELIGION TO PUBLIC EDUCATION: THE BASIC PRINCIPLES *by the Committee on Religion and Education of the American Council on Education Studies* (Volume XI), *Washington, D.C.*, 1947, $1.00.

THIS report is provocative because more and more men are realizing that morality is a better weapon to save the world from destruction than the atom bomb. An indispensable source of morality is religion, for "religion has always supplied moral sanctions for men's actions." The first ten chapters of this report, therefore, try to show that the relationship between religion and public education is not satisfactory, and that the exclusion of religious subject-matter "is neither required on grounds of public policy nor consistent with sound educational principles."

To reach these conclusions the report proceeds slowly and throughly, pointing out first the reasons why life in the Western World has become so secularized, and then showing how historically this secularization has influenced the development of public education in the U.S. Careful about basic assumptions, it next considers two important definitions at length — religion and teaching.

A definition of religion is easily given although the very fact that it must be given is proof of how secular our age has become. But a definition of teaching is not so easily given, for the whole problem of indoctrination and freedom of thought must be considered. However, it makes clear that education must be both "transmissive and critical," for "it must equip the young not only to *pass* on the culture but to pass *on* the culture." Since religion is an important phase of the culture, the report believes that "the responsibility of public education with reference to religion is determined by fidelity to the culture in its entirety."

Inasmuch as the report stresses religion in the broad sense as opposed to sectarianism, an important question is the subject of Chapter V, "Shall the Schools Teach a Common Core of Religious Belief?" Here is highly controversial material, and the report urges further study in this direction. It recognizes quite frankly that this is merely the beginning of more comprehensive study. However, the conclusion which is reached on this particular question is worth noting:

> . . . The criterion of acceptance is not universal agreement; rather it may be said that the presumption is in favor of inclusion in the school program of any area of interest that lends itself to objective study if a substantial portion of the constituency of the schools regards it as of vital concern.

Central in this whole discussion of religion and public education is the separation of church and state. The report puts the case very well, stating finally that the authors believe the core of meaning in the doctrine of sepa-

ration of church and state to be this: "There shall be no ecclesiastical control of political functions; there shall be no political dictation in the ecclesiastical sphere except as public safety or public morals may require it."

How religion is to be made a part of the program is another important question. The report says that the logic of the situation points to social studies. Since "no person is fully educated who has not gained a knowledge of the faiths men live by," it is also suggested that our great religious classics may be read in the same fashion as English classics. It may be added that some of them are already read as part of courses in world literature in both high school and college.

Of strategic importance is the function of the teacher. Although there is a substantial nucleus "who live and teach on the basis of fundamental religious assumptions," without the taint of sectarianism, many more such teachers are needed. So many more are needed that it would be unwise to solve the problem by relying on those few now teaching effectively.

The discussion includes the college, blaming "the increasing emphasis on the intellect and things of the intellect as the primary concern of the college," for the lack of religious emphasis. The result is that college teaching does not aim for genuine conviction — "one of the crying needs of our age." The reason for this insistence upon religious emphasis in addition to the scientific is made clear in a single sentence: "Action without past experience is blind, but action without moral imperatives is below the human level."

Lest there be some who feel that the teaching of religion in the schools will impair the rights of the parents, the report feels that the function of the home in religious education will be strengthened rather than weakened. However, it is to be throughly understood that the reaction of the general public is a prerequisite to the acceptance or rejection of the proposal.

Finally, the report stresses the common heritage of the Judaeo-Christian tradition that belongs to Jews, Catholics, and Protestants alike. In times of threatening chaos when men act too frequently in terms of differences, it is good to find the report listing some of the great virtues which we hold in common: "the common source and spiritual equality of all men as the children of God; the obligation to respect the supreme worth of persons and the of redemptive love; the inexorableness of the law that he that soweth the wind shall reap the whirlwind." And so one of the last statements before the summary shines beacon-like in an increasingly stormy world: "The imperative toward moral betterment comes out of a common heritage."

Excellent as is this presentation of the problem of giving a place in public education to religion without impairing the principle of separation of church and state, it leaves some phases of the problem unexplored. Even though it is disclosed that those who are opposed to religion have as much

right to control the schools as those favoring religion, not enough attention is given to their thoughts and wishes. Nor again is enough credit given to ways and means being employed by all good teachers for achieving the results which religion tries to produce. Perhaps the chief fault lies in the chapter which defines religion, since it leaves the impression that religion is an end in itself rather than a means to an end. It is not enough to state that "to those who take it seriously, rleigious faith is the spiritual foundation of society and indispensable to enduring social structure." Such a statement demands a Why? or a How? There are those who would sincerely and earnestly question the right of such an assumption. They would agree that moral ends are to be sought, but they would hold out for a more scientific method.

Nevertheless, since we must use every medium possible for securing good standards of morality, and since religion is such a medium, any discussion which tries to make this medium accessible to as many as possible, deserves well our best attention. *The Relation Of Religion To Public Education* is just such a discussion.

HAROLD C. BOHN

RELIGION IN COLLEGE TEXTBOOKS

COLLEGE READING AND RELIGION. A SURVEY OF COLLEGE READING MATERIALS *sponsored by the* EDWARD W. HAZEN FOUNDATION AND THE COMMITTEE ON RELIGION AND EDUCATION OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION. *Yale University Press, $5.00.*

THIS volume is entirely unique. It presents an appraisal of the treatment of religion in college textbooks commonly used in classes in American institutions of higher education. Fourteen scholars, chosen for competence in their respective fields, were asked to select representative books and appraise them in terms of the adequacy of their handling of religious subject matter as it appears in their several disciplines. The fields covered are history of philosophy, problems of philosophy, psychology, psychiatry, history and philosophy of education, English literature, music, European history, economics, sociology, cultural anthropology, physical sciences and biological sciences.

The findings of the study are illuminating and important. They are by no means uniform, as the chairman of the committee in charge of the study, Dean Donald P. Cottrell of Ohio State University's College of Education, makes clear in the Introduction. He outlines the conclusions of the study under five heads:

1. Religion is "neglected or ignored" in college textbooks, a condition that "may be attributable in considerable measure to incompetence of both scholarship and teaching practices among faculty members who might

reasonably be expected to consider religious objectives as fundamental to their work."

2. As for "overt hostility to religion," there is only indirect evidence of it. The books do reveal, however, a "kind of hostility" that is "exhibited in the apparently deliberate circumvention of religious and even the higher ethical issues in various fields."

3. Whether because of "materialistic assumptions" or not, there has been in recent years a considerable substitution of other subject matter for religious reading. Many scholars, because of their "intellectual organization and commitment" have shown a tendency to "accord to religion a position of inferior importance in their attention."

4. No sectarian bias was found. Differentiation between theological viewpoints was directed toward delineation of actual differences, not toward fostering a "sectarian spirit."

5. Reading lists tend to "favor inadequate conceptions of religion" and to "confuse different conceptions in the guise of interpretation." There is evidence of "persistent opposition to creedal and institutional religion" — an attitude on the merits of which the committee expresses no judgment.

The study makes it evident, says Dean Cottrell, "that religion is a neglected field of reading and study on the part of college students." Then he adds these two pregnant sentences:

> The lightness of touch and even ignorance with which intellectual issues having a religious bearing or import are dealt with would seem little less than astonishing when the expansion of scholarship in general is taken into account. Moreover, the hostility to religion revealed in some of the textbooks described becomes perhaps most effective when it is implied or suggested through the aggressive development of a positivistic attitude.

The several critiques merit careful study, not only by those whose major interest is in the field of religion, but by all who are concerned with the cultural adequacy of higher education.

F. Ernest Johnson

OTHER REVIEWS

The Heathens: Primitive Man and his Religions, *by* William Howells. *Doubleday & Company, Inc., $3.75.*

TWO virtues are required in a book on primitive religions; first, that it is an anthropologically sound, and second, that it recognizes and keeps within its own limits. On both counts this book qualifies. It is written in an engagingly popular style, and arranged topically. It covers the familiar major features of the primitive cults — tabu, magic, divination, witchcraft, ghosts, ancestor worship, and the rest.

As to the limitations of its approach to religion, the book is careful to state that the anthropologists are not seeking "any absolute value; it is only

to know what is actually being done and what human reasons lie behind it" (p. 3). The "anthropological view . . . attempts to say what religion does without necessarily saying what it is" (p. 20). This leaves room for the historical religions to validate themselves in the terms of their own data — something which the anthropologist often neglects to realize.

RELIGION IN THE 20TH CENTURY, *edited by* VERGILIUS FERM. *The Philosophical Library, $5.00.*

THIS book undertakes to portray "the religious landscape of the twentieth-century civilization." In this endeavor it calls on twenty-eight authors, each in the role of a proponent of a particular religious position. The material is organized according to "larger divisions of religious ideologies and practices" rather than by sects and denomination. This has put a heavy burden of selection upon the editor, the results of which are open to considerable debate. Protestantism, for example, is presented in the two aspects of liberalism and conservatism: Judaism, under the captions, conservatism, reform and "Reconstructionism." But the writer chosen as the conservative Protestant representative wants to distinguish himself from the "fundamentalist" and "modernist," as well as the "liberal." One would think that these variations might merit separate consideration equal to that of Jewish "Reconstructionism." Neo-Orthodoxy might also lay claim to a place, since it is certainly one of the most potent of current religious tendencies. On the other hand, it is a true insight which leads the author to count "vigor and enthusiasm" as qualities which entitle a religious position to a hearing as well as antiquity. The editor's "look around" within the present, in contrast with a mere probing into the past, yields a number of interesting interpretations not found in encyclopedia articles — which the contents of the book otherwise considerably resemble.

NOTE AND COMMENT

(*Continued from p. xvi*)

AMERICAN DELEGATES TO THE WORLD COUNCIL ASSEMBLY

Amsterdam, August 22–September 5, 1948

The following delegates have been appointed to date (May 1, 1948).

AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL: *Principals,* Bishop A. J. Allen, Bishop S. L. Greene, Bishop D. Ward Nichols; *Alternates,* Rev. G. W. Blakely, Dr. A. S. Jackson, Rev. M. E. Jackson.

AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL ZION: *Principals,* Bishop W. J. Walls, Bishop W. W. Matthews; *Alternates,* Bishop B. G. Shaw, Rev. D. P. Thomas.

AMERICAN LUTHERAN: *Principals,* Mr. M. C. Ewald, Dr. Harold L. Yochum.

CHURCH OF THE BRETHREN: *Principals,* Dr. Raymond R. Peters, Dr. M. R. Zigler; *Alternates,* Dr. Calvert N. Ellis, Dr. J. Quinter Miller.

CONGREGATIONAL CHRISTIAN: *Principals,* Dr. Douglas Horton, Mrs. Robert G. Williams, Dr. Ronald Bridges, Dr. Fred S. Buchmeyer; *Alternates,* Dr. Theodore A. Greene, Miss Rosemary Park, Dr. Charles S. Johnson, Dr. Albert Buckner Coe.

DANISH EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN: *Principal,* Rev. Alfred Jensen.

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN AUGUSTANA SYNOD OF NORTH AMERICA: *Principals,* Dr. P. O. Bersell, Prof. N. A. Nilson; *Alternates,* Dr. E. E. Ryden, Prof. Theodore LeVander.

EVANGELICAL & REFORMED: *Principals,* Dr. L. W. Goebel, Dr. David A. Miller, Dr. George W. Richards; *Alternates,* Mrs. F. A. Goetsch, *Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, Dr. Carl E. Schneider.

EVANGELICAL UNITED BRETHREN: *Principals,* Bishop A. R. Clippinger, Bishop John S. Stamm, Dr. Walter N. Roberts; *Alternates,* Bishop C. H. Stauffacher, Bishop V. O. Weidler, Dr. H. R. Heininger.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION OF DISCIPLES OF CHRIST: *Principals,* Dr. George W. Buckner, Jr., Dr. Gaines M. Cook, Dr. Harry S. McCormick, Mrs. E. V. Pugh; *Alternates,* Dr. Hampton Adams, Dr. A. T. DeGroot, Dr. M. E. Sadler, Mrs. James D. Wyker.

METHODIST: *Principals,* Mr. Frank E. Baker, Bishop James C. Baker, Bishop Ivan Lee Holt, Bishop Paul B. Kern, Bishop W. C. Martin, Pres. J. Earl Moreland, Dr. John R. Mott, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, Dr. Theodore H. Palmquist, Dr. Paul W. Quillian, Dr. Ralph W. Sockman, Mrs. J. D. Bragg; *Alternates,* Mr. George Atkinson, Rev. E. H. Blackard, Bishop Charles W. Brashares, Dr. Henry Hitt Crane, Rev. George A. Fallon, Bishop W. Earl Ledden, Mr. D. Stewart Patterson, Dr. Richard C. Raines, Bishop Alex P. Shaw, Miss Sallie Lou MacKinnon, Mr. Charles C. Parlin, Rev. King Vivion.

MORAVIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA (NORTHERN PROVINCE): *Principal,* Dr. F. P. Stocker.

NATIONAL BAPTIST CONVENTION: *Principals,* Dr. J. H. Jackson, Dr. William H. Jernagin, Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, Dr. Calvin E. Stalnaker; *Alternates,* Dr. Sandy F. Ray, Dr. R. W. Coleman.

NORTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION: *Principals,* Rev. E. T. Dahlberg, Dr. Dana M. Albaugh, Dr. R. E. Nelson, Mrs. L. E. Swain; *Alternates,* Mrs. H. G. Colwell, Rev. David P. Gaines, Rev. H. H. Straton, Rev. E. W. Parsons.

POLISH NATIONAL CATHOLIC: *Principal,* Rt. Rev. John Z. Jasinski.

*Also consultant.

PRESBYTERIAN, U.S.: *Principals,* Dr. John R. Cunningham, Mrs. G. S. Harrington, Dr. Homer McMillan; *Alternates,* Dr. J. McDowell Richards, Dr. P. D. Miller.

PRESBYTERIAN, U.S.A.: *Principals,* Dr. John MacKay, Dr. William B. Pugh, Mrs. John M. Irvine, Mr. Paul Moser; *Alternates,* Mrs. Paul Moser, Rev. H. Ray Anderson, Dr. George Emerson Barnes, *Dr. Henry P. Van Dusen.

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL: *Principals,* Rt. Rev. Henry K. Sherrill, Rt. Rev. Angus Dun, Very Rev. William H. Nes, Mr. Charles P. Taft; *Alternates,* Rt. Rev. Harwood Sturtevant, Rev. Theodore P. Ferris, Miss Leila Anderson, Mr. Clifford P. Morehouse.

REFORMED CHURCH IN AMERICA: *Principals,* Mr. Luke DeVries, Dr. Thomas Haig; *Alternates,* Rev. Bertram de H. Atwood, Mr. Clarence H. Linder.

THE RELIGIOUS SOCIATE OF FRIENDS, FIVE YEARS' MEETING: *Principal,* Dr. Algie I. Newlin; *Alternate,* Dr. D. Elton Trueblood.

GENERAL CONFERENCE OF SOCIETY OF FRIENDS: *Principal,* Dr. Bliss Forbush.

YEARLY MEETING OF RELIGIOUS SOCIETY OF FRIENDS: *Principal,* Dr. Howard H. Brinton; *Alternate,* Mr. Thomas S. Brown.

SEVENTH DAY BAPTIST CONVENTION: *Principal,* Dr. Lloyd Seager.

UNITED LUTHERAN: *Principals,* Mrs. J. Lindsay Almond, Dr. Franklin Clark Fry, Dr. Abdel Ross Wentz, Dr. Clarence C. Stoughton; *Alternates,* Dr. Stewart W. Herman, *Dr. O. Frederick Nolde, Miss Barbara Wiegand, Dr. J. Lindsay Almond.

UNITED PRESBYTERIAN: *Principals,* Rev. J. Kenneth Miller, Dr. Theophilus M. Taylor; *Alternate,* Rev. J. Calvin Rose.

COLORED METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH: *Principals,* Bishop Arthur J. Hamlett, Dr. B. Julian Smith; *Alternates,* Mrs. Lana Hamlett, Dr. E. P. Murchison.

CONSULTANTS (not selected on a denominational basis): Dr. Edwin E. Aubrey (Northern Baptist), Dr. Roswell P. Barnes (Presbyterian, U.S.A.), Prof. John C. Bennett (Congregational Christian), Mrs. Samuel McCrea Cavert (Presbyterian, U.S.A.), Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert (Presbyterian, U.S.A.), Prof. Clarence T. Craig (Methodist), Dr. John W. Decker (Baptist), Miss Georgia Harkness (Methodist), Dr. Conrad Hoffman (Presbyterian, U.S.A.), Mrs. Douglas Horton (Congregational Christian), Prof. Walter M. Horton (Congregational Christian), Prof. Kenneth S. Latourette (Northern Baptist), Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr (Evangelical & Reformed), Rev. O. Frederick Nolde (United Lutheran), Rt. Rev. G. Ashton Oldham (Episcopalian), Dr. Charles W. Ranson (Irish Methodist), Mr. Wesley F. Rennie (Methodist), Dr. Henry P. Van Dusen (Presbyterian, U.S.A.).